THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by

G. Johannes Botterweck

Helmer Ringgren

Heinz-Josef Fabry

VOLUME XV

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Volume 15
Translated from
Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament
Band VIII, Lieferungen 1-7
Published 1994-1995 by
Verlag W. Kohlhammer GmbH, Stuttgart, Germany

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
2140 Oak Industrial Drive N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505 /
P.O. Box 163, Cambridge CB3 9PU U.K.

Printed in the United States of America

11 10 09 08 07 06 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Botterweck, G. Johannes
Theological dictionary of the Old Testament
Translation of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
Translated by David E. Green and Douglas W. Stott
Includes rev. ed. of v. 1-2.
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Bible. O.T. — Dictionaries — Hebrew. 2. Hebrew language — Dictionaries — English.
I. Ringgren, Helmer, 1917 — joint author. II. Fabry, Heinz-Josef — joint author.
III. Title.
ISBN-10: 0-8028-2338-6 / ISBN-13: 978-0-8028-2338-0 (set)

Volume XV ISBN-10: 0-8028-2339-4 / ISBN-13: 978-0-8028-2339-7

www.eerdmans.com

CONTENTS

Page

Contributors v

Editors' Preface xi

Abbreviations xiii

Transliteration xxvii

שָׁכַר *šāḵar;* שֵׁכָר *šēḵār* **become intoxicated; intoxicating drink** (Oeming) 1

שֶׁלֶג *šeleg;* **שׁלג** *šlg* **snow** (Ernst) 6

שָׁלָה *šālâ;* שַׁלְוָה *šalwâ;* שָׁלֵו *šālēw;* שָׁלוּ *šālû* **ease; rest, quiet** (Grünwaldt) 9

שָׁלוֹם *šālôm* **peace** (Stendebach) 13

שָׁלַח *šālaḥ* **extend; send** (Hossfeld, van der Velden, Dahmen) 49

שֻׁלְחָן *šulḥān* **table** (Ernst) 73

שָׁלַט *šālaṭ;* שַׁלִּיט *šallîṭ;* שָׁלְטָן *šolṭān* **have power** (Sæbø) 83

שׁלך *šlk;* שָׁלָךְ *šālāḵ;* שַׁלֶּכֶת *šalleḵeṯ* **throw** (Thiel) 88

שָׁלֵם *šālēm* **(re)pay; make peace; whole, peaceable** (Illman) 97

שְׁלָמִים *š^{e}lāmîm* **sacrifice, offering, meal** (Seidl) 105

שָׁלַף *šālap̱;* שֶׁלֶף *šelep̱* **draw** (Mommer) 117

שָׁלֹשׁ *šālōš;* שְׁלוֹשִׁים *š^{e}lôšîm;* שְׁלִשִׁי *š^{e}lišî;* **שׁלשׁ** *šlš piel, pual* שָׁלִישׁ *šālîš;* שִׁלְשׁוֹם *šilšôm;* שִׁלֵּשִׁם *šillēšîm* **three** (Beyse; Fabry) 119

שֵׁם *šēm* **name** (Reiterer; Fabry, Ringgren) 128

שׁמד *šmd* **destroy, remove** (Lohfink) 177

שָׁמַט *šāmaṭ;* שְׁמִטָּה *š^{e}miṭṭâ* **throw out, leave fallow** (Mulder†) 198

שָׁמַיִם *šāmayim* **heaven** (Bartelmus) 204

שָׁמִיר *šāmîr;* שַׁיִת *šayiṯ* **thorn** (Ringgren) 237

שָׁמֵם *šāmam;* שָׁמֵם *šāmēm;* שְׁמָמָה *šᵉmāmâ;* שִׁמָּמוֹן *šimmāmôn;* מְשַׁמָּה *mᵉšammâ;* שִׁמְמָה *šimᵉmâ;* יְשִׁמֹן/יְשִׁימוֹן *yᵉšimōn/yᵉšîmôn;* יְשִׁמוֹת *yᵉšimôṯ* **desolate, desolation** (Meyer) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · 238

שֶׁמֶן *šemen;* שָׁמֵן *šāmēn;* שָׁמָן *šāmān* **oil** (Ringgren) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · 249

שָׁמַע *šāmaʿ;* שֵׁמַע *šēmaʿ;* שְׁמוּעָה *šᵉmûʿâ* **hear** (Rüterswörden) · · · · · · · · · 253

שָׁמַר *šāmar;* אַשְׁמֻרָה/אַשְׁמֹרֶת *ʾašmûrâ/ʾašmōreṯ;* מִשְׁמָר *mišmār;* שָׁמְרָה *šomrâ;* שְׁמֻרָה *šᵉmurâ;* שִׁמֻּרִים *šimmurîm;* שֶׁמֶר *šemer* **watch, keep** (García López) · 279

שֶׁמֶשׁ *šemeš* **sun** (Lipiński) · 305

שֵׁן *šēn* **tooth, ivory** (Kapelrud†) · 313

שָׁנָה *šānâ* **change; repeat** (Kronholm†) · 317

שָׁנָה *šānâ* **year** (Stendebach) · 323

שָׁנִי *šānî* **crimson** (Beyse) · 339

שָׁנַן *šānan;* שְׁנִינָה *šᵉnînâ* **sharpen** (Kellermann†; Ringgren) · · · · · · · · · 343

שָׁסָה *šāsâ;* שָׁסַס *šāsas;* מְשִׁסָּה *mᵉšissâ* **plunder, spoil** (Mommer) · · · · · · · 346

שָׁעָה *šāʿâ* **look, regard** (Lundbom) · 349

שׁען *šʿn;* מִשְׁעָן *mišʿān;* מִשְׁעֶנֶת *mišʿeneṯ* **support oneself, rely** (Dahmen) · 352

שָׁעַע *šāʿaʿ;* שִׁעֲשַׁע *šiʿᵃšaʿ;* שַׁעֲשֻׁעִים *šaʿᵃšûʿîm* **paste together; delight** (Hausmann) · 357

שַׁעַר *šaʿar* **gate** (Otto) · 359

שִׁפְחָה *šipḥâ* **secondary wife** (Reuter) · 405

שָׁפַט *šāpaṭ;* שֹׁפֵט *šōpēṭ* **lead, rule; judge; ruler** (Niehr) · · · · · · · · · · · 411

שָׁפַךְ *šāpaḵ;* שֶׁפֶךְ *šepeḵ;* שָׁפְכָה *šopḵâ* **pour** (Liwak) · · · · · · · · · · · · · 431

שָׁפֵל *šāpēl;* שָׁפָל *šāpāl;* שְׁפֵלָה *šᵉpēlâ* **be low; Shephelah** (Engelken) · · · · · 442

שָׁקַד *šāqaḏ;* שְׁקִידָה *šᵉqîḏâ;* שָׁקֵד *šāqēḏ;* מְשֻׁקָּד *mᵉšuqqāḏ* **take care of; almond** (Lipiński) · 448

שָׁקַט *šāqaṭ* **be quiet, at peace** (Bons) · 452

שָׁקַל *šāqal;* שֶׁקֶל *šeqel;* מִשְׁקָל *mišqāl* **shekel** (Oeming) · · · · · · · · · · · 457

שׁקף *šqp;* שֶׁקֶף *šeqep̱;* שְׁקֻפִים *šᵉqupîm;* מַשְׁקוֹף *mašqôp̱* **look down; lintel, lattice** (Mathys) · · · 462

שׁקץ *šqṣ;* שֶׁקֶץ *šeqeṣ;* שִׁקּוּץ *šiqqûṣ* **abominate, abominable** (Freedman, Welch) · · · 465

שׁקר *šqr;* שֶׁקֶר *šeqer* **violate a treaty** (Seebass, Beyerle, Grünwaldt) · · · 470

שָׁרַץ *šāraṣ;* שֶׁרֶץ *šereṣ* **teem, swarm, crawl** (Waschke) · · · 477

שָׁרַק *šāraq;* שְׁרֵקָה *šᵉrēqâ;* שְׁרִקָה* *šᵉriqâ;* מַשְׁרוֹקִי* *mašrôqî* **hiss, whistle** (Schmoldt) · · · 480

שְׁרִרוּת *šᵉrirûṯ;* שׁרר *šrr I;* שָׁרִיר *šārîr* **stubborn** (Fabry, van Meeteren) · · · 482

שֹׁרֶשׁ *šōreš;* שׁרשׁ *šrš* **root** (Renz) · · · 489

שׁרת *šrt* **serve** (Engelken) · · · 503

שָׁתָה *šāṯâ;* שׁקה *šqh* **drink** (Gamberoni) · · · 514

שָׁתַל *šāṯal;* שָׁתִיל* *šāṯîl* **plant** (Beyse) · · · 544

תְּאֵנָה *tᵉʾēnâ* **fig tree** (Ringgren) · · · 546

תֹּאַר *tōʾar;* תאר *tʾr* **form, figure** (Ringgren) · · · 548

תֵּבָה *tēḇâ* **ark** (Zobel†) · · · 550

תְּבוּאָה *tᵉḇûʾâ* **produce** (Zipor) · · · 553

תֵּבֵל *tēḇēl;* תֶּבֶל *teḇel* **world** (Fabry, van Meeteren) · · · 557

תֹּהוּ *tōhû* **trackless waste; lifelessness; futility** (Görg) · · · 565

תְּהוֹם *tᵉhôm* **sea** (Waschke) · · · 574

תּוֹלְדוֹת *tôlᵉḏôṯ* **(family/clan) history** (Schreiner) · · · 582

תּוֹלַעַת *tôlaʿaṯ;* תּוֹלֵעָה *tôlēʿâ;* תּוֹלָע *tôlāʿ;* תלע *tlʿ* **worm; crimson** (Kellermann†, Ringgren) · · · 588

תּוֹעֵבָה *tôʿēḇâ;* תעב *tʿb* **abomination** (Preuss†) · · · 591

תור *twr* **investigate, spy out** (Liwak) · · · 604

תּוֹרָה *tôrâ* **instruction, teaching** (García López; Fabry) · · · 609

תּוּשִׁיָּה *tûšîyâ;* תֻּשִׁיָּה *tušîyâ* **intelligence, prudence** (Gertz) · · · 647

תַּחֲנוּנִים *taḥᵃnûnîm;* תְּחִנָּה *tᵉḥinnâ* **supplications** (Ringgren) · · · 650

תִּירוֹשׁ *tîrôš* **wine, juice** (Fleischer) · · · 653

תכן	*tkn;* תֹּכֶן *tōḵen;* תָּכְנִית *toḵnîṯ;* מַתְכֹּנֶת *matḵōneṯ* **be proper; equity** (Mommer)	662
תָּלָא/תָּלָה	*tālâ/tālā'* **hang, suspend** (Mulder†)	667
תלל	*tll II;* התל *htl;* הֲתֻלִים *h^atulîm;* מַהֲתַלּוֹת *mah^atallôṯ* **deceive** (Irsigler)	672
תָּמַהּ	*tāmah;* תִּמָּהוֹן *timmāhôn* **be amazed; horror, panic** (Berges)	681
תְּמוֹל	*t^emôl;* אֶתְמוֹל *'eṯmôl;* אֶתְמוּל *'eṯmûl;* אִתְּמוֹל *'itt^emôl* **yesterday** (Schmoldt)	685
תְּמוּנָה	*t^emûnâ* **visible form, image** (Waschke)	687
תָּמִיד	*tāmîḏ* **daily offering** (Beyse)	690
תָּמַךְ	*tāmaḵ* **grasp, hold** (Ruppert)	694
תָּמַם	*tāmam;* תָּם *tām;* תָּמִים *tāmîm;* תֹּם (תָּם) *tōm (tom-);* תֻּמָּה *tummâ;* תֻּמִּים *tummîm* **finished, completed** (Kedar-Kopfstein)	699
תַּן	**tan* **jackal; owl** (Frevel)	712
תַּנּוּר	*tannûr;* כִּבְשָׁן *kiḇšān;* כּוּר *kûr* **oven** (Oeming)	720
תַּנִּין	*tannîn* **dragon, serpent** (Niehr)	726
תָּעָה	*tā'â;* תּוֹעָה *tô'â;* טעה *ṭ'h* **wander about, stray** (Berges, Dahmen)	732
תֹּף	*tōp̄;* תפף *tpp* **timbrel** (Ottosson)	737
תָּפֵל	*tāpēl;* תִּפְלָה *tiplâ* **foolish talk; whitewash** (Marböck)	740
תפשׂ	*tpś* **grasp, seize** (Liwak)	745
תֹּפֶת	*tōpeṯ* **Topheth** (Mulder†)	753
תִּקְוָה	*tiqwâ* **hope** (Waschke)	759
תָּקַע	*tāqa';* תֵּקַע *tēqa';* תֹּקְעִים *tōq^e'îm* **drive; clap; blow (trumpet)** (Zobel†)	765
תְּרוּמָה	*t^erûmâ;* תְּרוּמִיָּה *t^erûmîyâ* **lift, raise** (Wächter, Seidl; Fabry)	770
תְּרָפִים	*t^erāpîm;* אֵפוֹד *'ēpôḏ;* בַּד *baḏ* **teraphim; ephod** (van der Toorn, Lewis)	777
תַּרְשִׁישׁ	*taršîš* **Tarshish; chrysolite** (Lipiński)	790

Editors' Preface to Volume XV

"A Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament is a bold venture any time it is undertaken." As the editors wrote this in the mid-1970s, they had in mind not so much the mechanical aspects of the project, but rather the ever daunting field of theological scholarship. The substantial developments that they envisioned at that time turned out to be even more rapid and more controversial than one could have expected. What had been projected as a task to be completed in a maximum of 10 years turned into an epic venture spanning more than a quarter century. Almost from the outset the original conception of the Dictionary required continuous modification, attested in an ever expanding number of terms and concepts addressed, with a grand total of approximately 1150 key words now included. New insights regarding grammar and linguistics constantly had to be considered, as well as advances in the study of epigraphy and unanticipated proliferation in publication of the Qumran texts. The rise of a full spectrum of new methodologies further necessitated setting new standards. The greatest challenge, however, remained the ongoing dialogue encompassing divergent theories and approaches to the biblical texts. Collaboration between the editors and authors sought to address prudently this situation of seemingly constant change so as not to attach hastily to new currents of thought but rather to present responsible opinions. In the process consensus also had to be reached on fundamental matters of lexicography so as not to become bogged down in the perplexities of interpretation. A Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament can provide a great deal, but not everything.

Volumes I-XV of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament,* covering the Hebrew terms, are now completed. Only one volume on Aramaic terms follows (Volume XVI), under the editorship of Professor Dr. Ingo Kottsieper of Göttingen (see ZAH 8 [1995] 80-81). The series will conclude with Volume XVII, which will enhance access to the Dictionary by means of a general index and which will also provide supplementary bibliography updating entries throughout the set.

To all of our contributors, a hearty word of thanks for your many years of service. Of foremost importance are the authors of the individual articles, who have with great competence and preparation addressed their topics and offered insights reflecting scholarship of the highest order. A number of these contributors have also provided skillful translations, and many articles were extensively rewritten. The editorial teams in both Bonn and Uppsala have made substantial contributions. For Bonn, sincere thanks to H. Lamberty-Zielinski, H. Baranske, G. Barteldrees, A. Doecker, E. Hamacher, M. Rapp-Pokorny, M. Riehmen, and N. van Meeteren, as well as E. Ballhorn, U. Dahmen, C. Röttgen-Burtscheidt, J. Schnocks, and M. Seufert. For Uppsala, special appreciation to G. André. Quite applicable for the members of these teams has occa-

sionally been the lament of the Preacher in Eccl. 12:12: "Of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh."

Particular gratitude is expressed to Headmaster F. Stöhr, emeritus, of Heinsberg, who with great precision verified the biblical citations and reviewed critically the LXX sections of individual articles. In addition, many of the corrections incorporated into the English edition stem from his work.

Finally, we reiterate our appreciation to technical advisors Jan Bergman (Egyptology), Oswald Loretz (Ugaritic), and Wolfram Freiherr von Soden (Akkadian).

In the course of our work we have encountered the death of Founding Editor Gerhard Johannes Botterweck as well as of several authors: Sverre Aalen, Peter R. Ackroyd, Gösta W. Ahlström, Luis Alonso-Schökel, Christoph Barth, Jan Bergman, Herrmann Eising, Otto Eissfeldt, Alfred Haldar, Vinzen Hamp, Gerhard F. Hasel, Alfred Jepsen, Arvid S. Kapelrud, Dieter Kellermann, Walter Kornfeld, Hans Kosmala, Tryggve Kronholm, Daniel Levy, Paul Maiberger, Martin J. Mulder, Horst-Dietrich Preuss, Joseph Reindl, Josef Scharbert, Otto Schilling, Wolfram von Soden, Siegfried Wagner, and Hans-Jürgen Zobel. To all of them belong our gratitude and our respectful remembrances.

The well-known saying, "quem dii oderunt, lexicographum fecerunt [those whom the gods wish to destroy, they make into dictionary editors]" may at times have accurately characterized the disposition of the editors, but the countless experiences of fruitful collegial collaboration, out of which grew numerous friendships, overshadowed those aspects of the process. And it is particularly befitting for the editors, that our editor at W. Kohlhammer GmbH, Jürgen Schneider, has always been "in unserem Bund der Dritte (the third in our Federation)."

Heinz-Josef Fabry/Helmer Ringgren

Abbreviations

A	Alexandrinus (LXX MS)
AANLR	*Atti dell'Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti,* Rome
AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven
ÄAT	*Ägypten und Altes Testament: Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des AT*
AB	*Anchor Bible,* ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, N.Y.
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary,* ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
AbrN	*Abr-Nahrain,* Leiden
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta orientalia,* Copenhagen, Leiden
act.	active
adj.	adjective
ADPV	*Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins,* Wiesbaden
adv.	adverb, adverbial
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung,* Graz
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch.* 3 vols. Wiesbaden, 1965-81
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli*
AJBI	*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* Tokyo
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* Chicago
Akk.	Akkadian
AKM	*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden, Hildesheim
Amhar.	Amharic
Ammon.	Ammonite
Amor.	Amorite
AN	J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung. MVÄG* 44. 1939
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
AnBibl	*Analecta biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions.* 2 vols. Eng. tr., 1961, repr. 1965; repr. 2 vols. in 1, Grand Rapids, 1997
ANEP	*Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, 1954, ²1969
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, ³1969
ANH	G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch.* Göttingen, ²1922, ³1938
AnOr	*Analecta orientalia,* Rome
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* Berlin, 1972–
AnSt	*Anatolian Studies,* Ankara, London
AO	*Der Alter Orient,* Leipzig
AOAT	*Alter Orient und AT,* Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn
AOB	*Altorientalische Bilder zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann. Berlin, ²1927
AOS	*American Oriental Series,* New Haven
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann. Berlin, ²1926, repr. 1953

AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* 1923, repr. Osnabrück, 1976
APN	K. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names. AnAcScFen* 43/1. 1914, repr. 1966
APNM	H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts.* Baltimore, 1965
Aq.	Aquila
Arab.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
ARM	*Archives royales de Mari. Textes cunéiformes,* Paris
ArOr	*Archiv orientální,* Prague
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Freiburg, Leipzig, Berlin
ASAW	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
ASORDS	*American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series*
Assyr.	Assyrian
AT	Altes Testament, Ancien Testament, etc.
ATD	*Das AT Deutsch,* ed. V. Herntrich and A. Weiser. Göttingen
ATDA	J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla.* Leiden, 1976
AThANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATS	*Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT,* St. Ottilien, Munich
Aug	*Augustinianum,* Rome
AuOr	*Aula orientalis,* Barcelona
AuS	G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina.* 7 vols. 1928-42, repr. Hildesheim, 1964
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies,* Berrien Springs, Mich.
AV	Authorized (King James) Version
AzT	*Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
B	Vaticanus (LXX MS)
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Atlanta
Bab.	Babylonian, Babylonian Talmud
BAfO	*Beiheft zur AfO*
BaghM	*Baghdader Mitteilungen,* Berlin
BAH	*Bibliothèque archéologique et historique,* Paris
BAr	*Bulletin archéologique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques,* Paris
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review,* Washington, D.C.
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore
BASS	*Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft,* Leipzig, Baltimore
BBB	*Bonner biblische Beiträge*
BDAG	Walter Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago, [3]1999
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT.* Oxford, 1907; Peabody, Mass., [2]1979
BEATAJ	*Beiträge zur Erforschung des ATs und des antiken Judentums,* Frankfurt am Main
Beeston	A. F. L. Beeston et al., *Sabaic Dictionary.* Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982
Benz	F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions. StPohl* 8. 1972
BeO	*Bibbia e Oriente,* Milan
Bergsträsser	G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik.* 2 vols. 1918-29; repr. Darmstadt, 1985
BethM	*Beth Miqra,* Jerusalem

BETL	*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium,* Paris, Gembloux
BEvT	*Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie,* Munich
Beyer	K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer.* Göttingen, 1984
BFCT	*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie,* Gütersloh
BHHW	*Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke. 4 vols. Göttingen, 1962-66; index and maps, 1979
BHK	*Biblia hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel. Stuttgart, [3]1929
BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1966-77
BHT	*Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,* Tübingen
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation,* Leiden
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
bibliog.	bibliography
Biella	J. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect. HSS* 25. 1982
BietOr	*Biblica et orientalia,* Rome
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale,* Cairo
BiKi	*Bibel und Kirche,* Stuttgart
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben,* Düsseldorf
BiOr	*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Leiden
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies,* Winona Lake
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar AT,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff. Neukirchen-Vluyn
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag. Einsiedeln, 1951, [2]1968
BLe	H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des ATs.* 1918-22, repr. Hildesheim, 1991
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri.* New Haven, 1953
BN	*Biblische Notizen,* Bamberg
BOT	*De Boeken van het OT,* Roermond en Maaseik
BRev	*Bible Review,* Washington, D.C.
BRL	*Biblisches Reallexikon. HAT* I/1. 1937, [2]1977, ed. K. Galling
BSac	*Bibliotheca sacra,* Dallas
BSal	*Bibliotheca Salmanticensis,* Salamanca
BSAW	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BT	*Bible Translator,* London
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Rome
BThS	*Biblisch-theologische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BuA	B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien.* 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1920-26
BVC	*Bible et vie chrétienne,* Paris
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Leipzig, Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature.* Oxford, 1960
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Paderborn
BZAW	*Beihefte zur ZAW,* Berlin
ca.	circa, about
CAD	*Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.* 1956–
CahRB	*Cahiers de la RB,* Paris
Can.	Canaanite
CAT	*Commentaire de l'AT,* Neuchâtel

CBOT	*Coniectanea biblica, OT Series,* Lund
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series,* Washington
CC	*Continental Commentary,* Minneapolis
CD A,B	Damascus document, manuscript A, B
cf.	compare, see
ch(s).	chapter(s)
CH	Code of Hammurabi
Chr	Chronicler, Chronistic
ChrH	Chronicler's History/historian
ChW	J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums.* 2 vols. Leipzig, 1867-68, repr. 1959
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum.* Paris, 1881–
cj.	conjecture
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends.* Edinburgh, 1956; [2]1978, ed. J. C. L. Gibson
col.	column
comm(s).	commentary(ies), commentator(s)
conj.	conjecture
consec.	consecutive
const.	construct
ContiRossini	K. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica.* Rome, 1931
Copt.	Coptic
corr.	correction, corrected
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* Paris
CSD	R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary.* Oxford, 1903, repr. 1976
CT	*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum.* London, 1896ff.
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit.* 2 vols. Paris, 1963
CTH	*Catalogue des textes hittites,* ed. E. Laroche. Paris, 1971
CThM	*Calwer theologische Monographien,* Stuttgart
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly,* St. Louis
CV	*Communio viatorum,* Prague
D	Deuteronomist source
D	D (doubling) stem
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ed. F. Vigouroux. Paris, 1895-1912
DBAT	*Dielheimer Blätter zum AT*
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement,* ed. L. Pirot et al. Paris, 1926–
DD	*Dor le Dor,* Jerusalem
DH	M. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History. JSOTSup* 15. Eng. tr. [2]1991
dir.	direct
DISO	C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest.* Leiden, 1965
diss.	dissertation
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.* Oxford, 1955–
DMOA	*Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui,* Leiden
DN	divine name
Dtn	Deuteronomic (source)
Dtr	Deuteronomistic (source)
DtrH	Deuteronomistic History/historian

DtrN	nomistic Deuteronomistic source
DtrP	prophetic Deuteronomistic redactor
E	Elohistic source
EA	Tell el-Amarna tablets
ed.	edition, editor
EdF	*Erträge der Forschung,* Darmstadt
Egyp.	Egyptian
EH	*Europäische Hochschulschriften,* Frankfurt, Bern
EMiqr	*Enṣiqlōpedyā miqrā'it (Encyclopedia Biblica).* Jerusalem, 1950–
emph.	emphatic
EncBib	*Encyclopaedia Biblica,* ed. T. K. Cheyne, 4 vols. London, 1800-1903, repr. 1958
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia judaica.* 16 vols. Jerusalem, New York, 1971-72
EnEl	Enuma Elish
Eng.	English
ERE	*EREEncyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. J. Hastings, 13 vols. New York, 1913-27
ErfThSt	*Erfurter theologische Studien,* Leipzig
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft, Ergänzungsreihe, Ergänzungsband
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel,* Jerusalem
ESE	M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik.* 3 vols. Giessen, 1900-1915
esp.	especially
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos,* Madrid
ÉtB	*Études bibliques,* Paris
Eth.	Ethiopic
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* Louvain
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses,* Montpellier
EÜ	Einheitsübersetzung der Heilige Schrift. Stuttgart, 1974-80
Even-Shoshan	A. Even-Shoshan, *New Concordance of the Bible.* Jerusalem, ⁴1983
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich
ExpT	*Expository Times,* Edinburgh
FAT	*Forschungen zum Alten Testament,* Tübingen
fem.	feminine
fig(s).	figure(s)
FO	*Folia orientalia,* Kraków
fr(s).	fragment(s)
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Göttingen
FS	Festschrift
FThSt	*Freiburger theologischer Studien*
FuF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin
FzB	*Forschung zur Bibel,* Würzburg
G, Gtn	basic *(Grund)* stem, reflexive stem
GaG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. AnOr* 33. 1952, ²1969 (with Erg., *AnOr* 47)
Ger.	German
GesB	W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT.* Berlin, ¹⁷1921, ¹⁸1987–
GesTh	W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraecae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti.* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1829-58
Gilg.	Gilgamesh epic

Gk. — Greek

GK — W. Gesenius and E. Kautsch, *Hebräische Grammatik.* Halle, ^{28}1909 (= Kautsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [Eng. tr., Oxford, ^{2}1910])

GMA — *Göttinger Miszellen Ägypten*

GSAT — *Gesammelte Studien zum AT*

GTA — *Göttinger theologische Arbeiten*

GTTOT — J. J. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT.* Leiden, 1959

Guillaume — A. Guillaume, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicography* (repr. Leiden, 1965)

H — Holiness Code

Habil. — Habilitationschrift

HAL — L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, et al., *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT.* 2 vols. Eng. tr., Leiden, 2001 (repr. of 5 vols. plus Sup, with same pagination)

HAR — *Hebrew Annual Review,* Columbus, Ohio

HAT — *Handbuch zum AT,* ser. 1, ed. O. Eissfeldt. Tübingen

HAW — *Handbuch der altertumswissenschaft,* Munich

HBT — *Horizons in Biblical Theology,* Pittsburgh

Heb. — Hebrew

Hen — *Henoch*

Herm — *Hermeneia,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis

Hitt. — Hittite

HKAT — *Handkommentar zum AT,* ed. W. Nowack. Göttingen

HO — *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* Leiden

HP — E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi'el.* Zurich, 1968

HPT — M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions.* Eng. tr., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972

HS — *Hebrew Studies,* Madison

HSAT — *Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. E. Kautsch and A. Bertholet. 4 vols. Tübingen, ^{4}1922-23

HSM — *Harvard Semitic Monographs,* Cambridge

HSS — *Harvard Semitic Studies,* Cambridge; Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta

HTR — *Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge

HTS — *Harvard Theological Studies,* Cambridge

HUCA — *Hebrew Union College Annual,* Cincinnati

ICC — *International Critical Commentary,* Edinburgh

IDB — *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962; *Sup,* ed. K. Crim. Nashville, 1976

IEJ — *Israel Exploration Journal,* Jerusalem

ILC — J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture.* 4 vols. in 2. Eng. tr., Oxford, 1926-40, ^{5}1963

ill(s). — illustration(s)

impf. — imperfect(ive)

impv. — imperative

inf. — infinitive

in loc. — on this passage

Int — *Interpretation,* Richmond

intrans. — intransitive

Intro(s). — Introduction(s) (to the)

IPN — M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT* 46 (III/10). 1928, repr. 1980

J — Yahwist source (J^1, earliest Yahwist source; J^S, secondary Yahwist source)

JA — *Journal asiatique,* Paris

JANES — *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*, New York

JAOS — *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Baltimore, Boston, New Haven

Jastrow — M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 1903; repr. 2 vols. in 1. Brooklyn, 1975

JBL — *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Philadelphia; Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta

JBLMS — *Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*

JBT — *Jahrbuch für Theologie*, Neukirchen

JCS — *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, New Haven, Cambridge, Philadelphia, Baltimore

JE — Yahwist-Elohist source

JE — *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, ed. I. Singer, 12 vols. New York, 1916

JEOL — *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux,"* Leiden

Jer. — Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud

JESHO — *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, London

JJS — *Journal of Jewish Studies*, London

JM — P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Subsidia biblica* 14/I-II. Eng. tr., Rome, 1991, repr. 1996

JNES — *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Chicago

JNSL — *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, Stellenbosch

Jos. Asen. — Joseph and Aseneth

JPOS — *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Jerusalem

JPS — Jewish Publication Society

JQR — *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia

JRAS — *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London

JSHRZ — *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Gütersloh

JSJ — *Journal for the Study of Judaism*

JSOT — *Journal for the Study of the OT*, Sheffield

JSOTSup — *Journal for the Study of the OT, Supplement*, Sheffield

JSS — *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Manchester

JTS — *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oxford

Jud — *Judaica*, Zurich

K — *Ketib*

KAI — H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden, ^{2}1966-69, ^{3}1971-76

KAR — *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*. Leipzig, 1923

KAT — *Kommentar zum AT*, ed. E. Sellin and J. Herrmann. Leipzig, Gütersloh

KAV — *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*

KBL — L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden, ^{1}1953, ^{2}1958, ^{3}1967–96

KD — C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the OT*. 10 vols. Eng. tr., repr. Grand Rapids, 1954

KEHAT — *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT*, ed. O. F. Fridelin. Leipzig, 1812-96

KHC — *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT*, ed. K. Marti. Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen

KlSchr — *Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt [Munich, 1953-59, ^{3}1964]; O. Eissfeldt [Tübingen, 1962-79]; K. Elliger [*ThB* 32 (1966)]; E. Kutsch [*BZAW* 168 (1986)]; E. Meyer [Halle, 1910-24])

König — E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT*. Leipzig, 1910; ^{7}1936

KTU	*Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit,* I, ed. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *AOAT* 24. 1976
KUB	*Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen
Kuhn	K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten.* Göttingen, 1960; Nachträge, *RevQ* 4 (1963-64) 163-234
l(l).	line(s)
L	Lay source
L.A.E.	Life of Adam and Eve
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon.* 8 vols. London, 1863-93, repr. 1968
LAPO	*Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient,* Paris
Lat.	Latin
LD	*Lectio divina,* Paris
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon. UCP* 20. Los Angeles, 1958
Leš	*Lešonénu,* Jerusalem
LexÄg	W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie.* Wiesbaden, 1975–
LexHebAram	F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti.* Rome, 1958, repr. 1968
LexLingAeth	A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae.* Leipzig, 1865
LexSyr	C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum.* Halle, 1928, ^{2}1968
Lisowsky	G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen AT.* Stuttgart, 1958, ^{2}1966
lit.	literally
Lohse	E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran.* Munich, ^{2}1971
LOT	Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans.* Jerusalem, 1957
LUÅ	*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*
LXX	Septuagint (LXX^{A}, Codex Alexandrinus; LXX^{B}, Codex Vaticanus; LXX^{L}, Lucianic recension; LXX^{Or}, Origen; LXX^{R}, Codex Veronensis; LXX$^{S[1,2]}$, Codex Sinaiticus, correctors 1, 2, etc.; LXX^{Vn}, Aldine ed.)
MAD	*Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary.* Chicago, 1952-57
Mand.	Mandaic
Mandelkern	S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae.* Tel Aviv, 1971
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig
MARI	*Mari, annales de recherches interdisciplinaires*
MarThSt	*Marburger theologische Studien,* Marburg
masc.	masculine
MdD	E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary.* Oxford, 1963
MDOG	*Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft,* Berlin
Meyer	R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik.* 4 vols. Berlin, ^{3}1966-72
mg.	margin
MGWJ	*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* Breslau
Michel	D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax,* I. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977
Midr.	Midrash
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung,* Berlin
Mish.	Mishnah
MPL	J. P. Migne, *Patrologia latina,* 221 vols. (Paris, 1841-1864); sup, 5 vols. (1958-1970)
Moab.	Moabite
MRS	*Mission de Ras Shamra,* Paris
ms(s).	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text

MTS	*Münchener theologische Studien*, Munich
Mur	Wadi Murabbaʿat text(s)
Mus	*Muséon*, Louvain
MUSJ	*Mélanges de l'Université St.-Joseph*, Beirut
MVÄG	*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft* (Berlin), Leipzig
n(n).	note(s)
N, Ntn	passive, reflexive stem
Nabat.	Nabatean
NBL	*Neues Bibel-Lexikon*, ed. M. Görg. Zurich, 1991
NBSS	T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg, 1910
NCBC	*New Century Bible Commentary*, Grand Rapids and London
NEB	New English Bible
NEB	*Die Neue Echter-Bibel*, Würzburg
NedTT	*Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift*, Wageningen
NGTT	*Nederduitse gereformeerde teologiese tydskrif*, Capetown
NICOT	*New International Commentary on the OT*, Grand Rapids
no(s).	number(s)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version. New York, 1989
NSS	J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*. ^{2}1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967
NT	New Testament, Neues Testament, etc.
NTOA	*Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus*, Fribourg, etc.
NTS	*NT Studies*, Cambridge
obj.	object
OBO	*Orbis biblicus et orientalis*, Fribourg, Göttingen
ÖBS	*Österreichische biblische Studien*, Klosterneuberg
obv.	obverse of a papyrus or tablet
OIP	*Oriental Institute Publications*, Chicago
OL	Old Latin (OL^{S}, Fragmenta Sangallensia Prophetarum)
OLA	*Orientalia lovaniensia analecta*, Louvain
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensia periodica*, Louvain
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, Berlin
Or	*Orientalia*, Rome
OrAnt	*Oriens antiquus*, Rome
OSA	Old South Arabic
OT	Old Testament, Oude Testament, etc.
OTL	*Old Testament Library*, Philadelphia, Louisville
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*, Leiden
OTWSA	*Ou testamentiese werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika*, Pretoria
p(p).	page(s)
P	Priestly source (P^{G}, Priestly *Grundschrift* ["basic material"]; P^{S}, secondary Priestly source)
Palmyr.	Palmyrene
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PCRHP	*Publications du Centre de Recherches d'histoire et de philologie. Hautes études orientales*, Geneva
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, London
PEFQS	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, London
Pesh.	Peshitta
pf.	perfect(ive)
PFES	*Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society*, Helsinki

Phil.-hist. Kl.	Philosophische-historische Klasse
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch,* Berlin
pl(s).	plate(s)
pl.	plural
PLO	*Porta linguarum orientalium,* Wiesbaden
PN	personal name
PN	H. Ranke, *Die altägyptischen Personennamen.* 1935-52
PNPI	J. K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions.* Oxford, 1971
PNU	F. Grondähl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit. StPohl* 1. 1967
POT	*De Prediking van het OT,* Nijkerk
prep(s).	preposition(s)
PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit,* ed. C. F.-A. Schaeffer and J. Nougayrol. *MRS*
ptcp.	participle
PTMS	*Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series*
Pun.	Punic
PW	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* 6 vols. Stuttgart, 1839-52; Sup, 11 vols., 1903-56; ser. 2, 10 vols., 1914-48
Pyr.	K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte.* 4 vols. Leipzig, 1908-22
Q	Qumran scroll (preceded by arabic numeral designating cave)
Q	*Qere*
Qad	*Qadmoniot,* Jerusalem
QD	*Quaestiones disputatae,* Florence
r.	reverse (side of a tablet, coin, etc.)
R	Redactor (R^D, Deuteronomistic; R^P, Priestly; R^J, Yahwist; R^H, Holiness Code)
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale,* Paris
Rab.	Rabbah (midrashic commentary)
RAI	*Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,* Paris
RÄR	H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte.* Berlin, 1952, ^{2}1971
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris
RE	*Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* ed. A. Hauck. 24 vols. Leipzig, ^{3}1896-1913
REJ	*Revue des études juives,* Paris
repr.	reprint, reprinted
RES	*Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique.* Paris, 1900– (with number of text)
rev.	revised, revision
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack. 5 vols. Tübingen, ^{2}1927-31; ed. K. Galling, 6 vols., ^{3}1957-65
RHB	A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel.* Leipzig, 1908ff.
RHJ	*Rechtshistorisches Journal*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RivB	*Rivista biblica,* Rome, Brescia, etc.
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner. Berlin, 1932–
RM	*Die Religion der Menschheit,* Stuttgart
ro.	recto
RS	Ras Shamra text
RSF	*Revista di studi fenici*

RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali,* Rome
RSP	*Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* ed. L. R. Fisher et al. I, *AnOr* 49, 1972; II, *AnOr* 50, 1975; III, *AnOr* 51, 1981
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris
RTL	*Revue théologique de Louvain,* Louvain
S	superscription (to Psalms)
SAHG	A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebeten.* Zurich, 1953
Sam.	Samaritan
SANE	*Sources from the Ancient Near East,* Malibu
SANT	*Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich
SAOC	*Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization,* Chicago
SAT	*Die Schriften des ATs in Auswahl,* ed. H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann, 7 vols. Göttingen, ^{2}1920-22
SBAB	*Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände*
SBAW	*Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Munich
SBB	*Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge*
SBFLA	*Studii biblici franciscani liber annus,* Jerusalem
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	*SBL Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBLMS	*SBL Monograph Series,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBLSBS	*SBL Sources for Biblical Study,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBLWAW	*SBL Writings from the Ancient World,* Atlanta
SBS	*Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology,* London, Naperville, IL
SBTS	*Sources for Biblical and Theological Study,* Winona Lake, IN
ScrHier	*Scripta hierosolymitana,* Jerusalem
SDAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk Årsbok,* Lund
SEL	*Studi epigraphici e linguistici,* Rome, Verona
Sem.	Semitic
Sem	*Semitica,* Paris
sg.	singular
SGV	*Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften,* Tübingen
SJLA	*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* Leiden
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal for the Old Testament,* Århus
SNTSMS	*Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series,* Cambridge
SNumen	Supplement to *Numen,* Leiden
Soq.	Soqoṭri
SOTSMS	*Society for OT Studies Monograph Series,* Cambridge
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SR	*Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses,* Toronto
SSN	*Studia semitica neerlandica,* Assen
st.	status, state
ST	*Studia theologica,* Lund, Århus, Riga
St.-B.	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 6 vols. Munich, 1922-61
StBib	*Studia biblica,* Leiden
StBTh	*Studia biblica et theologica,* Pasadena, New Haven
STDJ	*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,* Leiden, Grand Rapids
StFS	*Studia Francisci Scholten,* Leiden
StOr	*Studia orientalia,* Helsinki

StPohl	*Studia Pohl,* Rome
STT	O. R. Gurney et al., *Sultantepe Tablets.* London, 1957
subj.	subject
subst.	substantive, substantival
suf.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
SUNT	*Studien zur Umwelt des NT,* Göttingen
Sup	Supplement(s) (to)
s.v.	*sub voce (vocibus),* under the word(s)
SVT	*Supplements to VT,* Leiden
Symm.	Symmachus
Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax.* Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie,* Paris
T.	Testament
TAJ	*Tel Aviv Journal*
TCL	*Textes Cunéiformes du Louvre*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 9 vols. plus index vol. Eng. tr., Grand Rapids, 1964-76
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the OT,* ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry. Eng. tr., Grand Rapids, 1974–
Tg(s).	Targum(s); Frag. Tg., Fragmentary Targum; Pal. Tg., Palestinian Targum; Tg. Jon., Targum Jonathan from Codex Reuchlinianus; Tg. Neof., Targum Neofiti; Tg. Onq., Targum Onqelos; Tg. Ps.-J., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TGI	K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels.* Tübingen, 1950, ^{2}1968, ^{3}1979
ThArb	*Theologische Arbeiten,* Berlin
ThAT	*Theologie des ATs*
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei,* Munich
Theod.	Theodotion
ThS	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich
Tigr.	Tigriña
TigrWb	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre-Sprache.* 1962
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the OT,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 3 vols. Eng. tr., Peabody, Mass., 1997
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
TM	Tell Mardikh-Ebla tablets
TO	A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *Textes ougaritiques. I. Mythes et légendes. LAPO.* 2 vols. 1974-89
Tomback	R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages. SBLDS* 32. 1978
Tos.	Tosephta
TP	*Theologie und Philosophie,* Freiburg im Breisgau
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen
tr.	translation, translated by
trans.	transitive
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause, G. Müller, and H. R. Balz, 22 vols. Berlin, 1977-92
TRev	*Theologische Revue,* Münster
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
TSSI	J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions,* 3 vols. Oxford, 1975-82
TTK	*Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke,* Oslo
TTZ	*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*

TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen,* Leipzig, Berlin
TUAT	*Texte aus der Umwelt des ATs,* Gütersloh
TW	*Theologische Wissenschaft,* Stuttgart, etc.
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin,* London
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
UBL	*Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur,* Münster
UCOP	*University of Cambridge Oriental Publications*
UCP	*University of California Publications*
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
Ugar.	Ugaritic
Univ.	University
Urk.	*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums,* ed. G. Steindorff. Leipzig, Berlin, 1903–
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. AnOr* 38. 1965, [2]1967
UUÅ	*Uppsala universitets årsskrift*
v(v).	verse(s)
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek,* 7 vols. Leipzig, 1907-16
VAS	*Vorasiatische Schriftdenkmäler,* Berlin
vb(s).	verb(s)
VD	*Verbum domini,* Rome
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 2 vols. 1908-13, repr. Hildesheim, 1961
Vg.	Vulgate
vo.	verso
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Wagner	M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96. 1966
WbÄS	A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* 6 vols. Leipzig, 1926-31, repr. 1963
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary,* Waco, Dallas, Nashville
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig. Stuttgart, 1965–
WBTh	*Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie,* Vienna
WbTigr	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre Sprache.* Wiesbaden, 1962
WdF	*Wege der Forschung,* Darmstadt
Wehr	H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic,* ed. J. M. Cowan. Ithaca, 1961, [3]1971, [4]1979
Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Language.* Cambridge, Mass., 1972
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* 4 vols. Leipzig, [2]1924, repr. 1963
WuD	*Wort und Dienst,* Bielefeld
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 106/3, 1963, [4]1974
WVDOG	*Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Berlin
YNER	*Yale Near Eastern Researches,* New Haven
YOS	*Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebräistik*

ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZB	Zürcher Bibel
ZBK	*Zürcher Bibelkommentare,* Zurich, Stuttgart
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
→	cross-reference within this Dictionary
<	derived from
>	whence derived, to
*	theoretical form
//	parallel (texts)

TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

◌ַ	a
◌ֲ	^{a}
◌ָ	ā
◌ָה	â
◌ָיו	āyw
◌ַי	ay
◌ָי	āy
◌ֶ	e
◌ֱ	^{e}
◌ֶי	ey
◌ֵ	ē
◌ֵי	ê
◌ְ	^{e}
◌ִ	i
◌ִי	î
◌ִיּ	îy
◌ָ	o
◌ֳ	^{o}
◌ֹ	ō
וֹ	ô
◌ֻ	u, ū
וּ	û

CONSONANTS

א	ʼ
בּ	b
ב	ḇ
גּ	g
ג	ḡ
דּ	d
ד	ḏ
ה, הּ	h
ו	w
ז	z
ח	ḥ
ט	ṭ
י	y
כּ, ךּ	k
כ, ך	ḵ
ל	l
מ, ם	m
נ, ן	n
ס	s
ע	ʻ
פּ	p
פ, ף	p̄
צ, ץ	ṣ
ק	q
ר	r
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š
תּ	t
ת	ṯ

שָׁכַר *šāḵar*; שֵׁכָר *šēḵār*

I. Etymology; Occurrences. II. Lexical Field. III. Archaeological Evidence. IV. Secular Usage. V. Theological Usage. VI. LXX. VII. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology; Occurrences. The root *škr* (verb: "become intoxicated"; noun: "intoxicating drink, [strong] beer") is Common Semitic and its meaning is constant. It appears in Akk. *šakāru,* "become intoxicated,"[1] and *šikāru,* "beer"; Ugar. *škr;*[2] Aram. *škr,* "intoxicating drink, beer";[3] Arab. *sakira,* "be intoxicated," and *sakar,* "intoxicating drink, wine";[4] and Syr. *šaḵrā,* "intoxicating drink."[5] The root even entered Greek as a loanword via the LXX: *síkera,* "strong drink, beer."[6]

The root *škr* occurs 58 times in the OT, with significant concentrations in Isaiah (16 times), Jeremiah (7), and Proverbs (4). The other occurrences are scattered: 2 in Genesis; 1 in Leviticus; 3 each in Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Judges; 2 each in 1 Kings and Ezekiel; 1 each in Joel, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Haggai; 2 in the Psalms; and 1 each in Job, Song of Songs, and Lamentations.

II. Lexical Field. The Hebrew lexical field "drink" (the most neutral expression is → שׁתה *šth*) can differentiate the manner of drinking (*gm',* "swallow"; *lqq,* "lap up"; *l'',* "swallow"; *mṣh,* "drain"), the quantity drunk (→ רוה *rwh,* "drink one's fill"; → שׁקה *šqh,* "give drink to, irrigate"), and the consequences (*sb',* "carouse"). The root *škr* sometimes has pejorative overtones, emphasizing the consequences of (ex-

---

šāḵar. M. Broshi, "Wine in Ancient Palestine," *Israel Museum Journal* 3 (1984) 21-40; E. Busse, *Der Wein im Kult des AT* (Freiburg, 1922); G. Dalman, *AuS,* IV (1935), esp. 291-413; J. Döller, "Der Wein in Bibel und Talmud," *Bibl* 4 (1923) 143-67, 267-99; W. Dommershausen, "Der Wein im Urteil und Bild des AT," *TTZ* 84 (1975) 253-60; K. Galling, "Wein und Weinbereitung," *BRL*², 362-63; G. Hagenow, *Aus dem Weingarten der Antike* (Mainz/Rhein, 1982); W. Helck, *Das Bier im alten Ägypt* (Berlin, 1971); W. Herrmann, "Götterspeise und Göttertrank in Ugarit und Israel," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 205-16; Y. Hirschfeld, "Ancient Wine Presses in the Park of Aijalon," *IEJ* 33 (1983) 207-18; Huber, "Bier und Bierbereitung in Babylonien," *RLA,* II, 25-28; D. Kellermann, "Bier," *NBL,* I, 294; G. Limbacher, *Weinbau in der Bibel* (Pressburg, 1931); Y. Magen, "Kalandia, a Vineyard Farm and Winery of Second Temple Times," *Qad* 17 (1984) 61-71; B. Meissner, *BuA,* I (1920), esp. 239-43, 417-20; M. Poo, "The Offering of Wine in Ancient Egypt" (diss., Johns Hopkins, 1983); F. Rainey, "Wine from the Royal Vineyards," *BASOR* 245 (1982) 57-62; W. Röllig, *Das Bier im alten Mesopotamien* (Berlin, 1970); L. Rost, "Noah der Weinbauer," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (1965), 44-53; C. Seltman, *Wine in the Ancient World* (London, 1957).

1. *CAD,* XVII/1, 157; *AHw,* III, 1139.
2. *KTU* 1.114, 4, 16.
3. *DISO,* 300; S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (1975), 553.
4. Wehr, 417.
5. *LexSyr,* 777.
6. BDAG, 923.

cessive) consumption of alcohol, and hence means "become inebriated, intoxicated, drunk."

III. Archaeological Evidence. Textual and iconographic evidence from Egypt and Mesopotamia documents the production of wine and beer since ca. 2800 B.C.E., but the practice is probably prehistoric. Alcohol enjoyed great popularity and was widely consumed among the Israelites and their neighbors, as a wealth of excavated production sites for alcoholic beverages attests.[7] Many recipes for the manufacture of (strong) beer have been preserved. From Egypt we have clay models of breweries and pictures of brewers carved on tombs and temple walls. The love goddess Hathor, with her orgiastic drinking feasts, enjoyed great popularity.[8]

In Babylonia beer was an everyday beverage, providing both nourishment and pleasure. "No meal without beer — in the palace, in the middle-class house, and in the shelter of the poor."[9] Wineries and special wine jars (some bearing seals), along with shops selling alcoholic beverages (mostly operated by women),[10] were normal features of cities; special drinking vessels were among the furnishings of better households. During the Hellenistic era in Israel, the wealthy farm at Kalandia attests that production of wine could yield substantial profits.[11] A goblet from the Jerusalem temple is depicted on the Arch of Titus.[12] The jar stamps demonstrate the existence of an international wine trade that included Palestine, Lebanon (cf. Hos. 14:8[Eng. 7]), Rhodes, and Greece.[13]

IV. Secular Usage. The regular consumption of alcohol by men and women appears to have been part of normal everyday life in Israel and was not socially suspect. As in Mesopotamia and Egypt, beer in particular was probably an everyday beverage, a kind of liquid bread. Wine, too, was not served just with better meals and banquets; it is mentioned frequently along with bread as a basic foodstuff (Gen. 14:18; 1 S. 16:20; 25:18). That alcohol was copiously available every day is clear from the sapiential warnings against intemperance as well as the nazirite oath,[14] which included abstention from alcohol (Nu. 6:1-21), a practice clearly considered unusual. The angel's command to Manoah's wife, the mother of Samson, to abstain from alcohol during her pregnancy (Jgs. 13:4,7,14) is particularly illuminating: on the one hand, it sets Samson apart as a nazirite even before birth; on the other hand, it demonstrates indirectly that pregnant women normally drank beer and wine.

---

7. Broshi, Galling, Hirschfeld.

8. For the whole topic see Helck.

9. Huber, 28; on the whole topic see Röllig.

10. Meissner, 239, 419-20: "beer pubs, taverns."

11. Magen.

12. See, e.g., O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. tr. 1978, repr. Winona Lake, 1997), 343 and fig. 460.

13. Hagenau, Limbacher, Seltman.

14. → נזר *nzr,* IX, 306-11, esp. 309-10.

The normal opinion of alcohol both as a foodstuff and as a luxury was positive. "Wine gladdens the human heart" (Ps. 104:15), "gladdens life" (Eccl. 10:19), and "cheers gods and mortals" (Jgs. 9:13). "Having a drink" was part of pleasant social gatherings, enjoyed by Joseph and his brothers (Gen. 43:34) and even by the tither in fellowship with God (Dt. 14:26). The very etymology of the name Noah, the "discoverer" of wine, proclaims the function of drinking: "It will bring us relief from our work and from the toil of our hands" (Gen. 5:29). Speaking metaphorically, Cant. 5:1 commands: "Drink . . . and be drunk with love."[15] Even (occasional) drunkenness is clearly commended as a source of comfort that lets the poor forget their poverty and the distressed their pain (Prov. 31:6-7).

But the society of ancient Israel, like modern society, also confronted the problem of chronic alcohol abuse. Wisdom teachers warn the higher officials and the king especially that drunkenness will hamper them in the performance of their duties (Prov. 31:4-5; cf. 20:1; 26:9). Echoes of this experience may be heard in the narratives of the DtrH: drunken Nabal loses his life by acting rashly toward David (1 S. 25:36), drunken King Elah is murdered by Zimri (1 K. 16:9-10), drunken Ben-hadad loses the battle (1 K. 20:16-21). Drunkenness makes the drinker reel and stagger (Ps. 107:27; Job 12:25), causes nausea and vomiting (e.g., Isa. 28:7-8; Jer. 48:26), encourages people to gossip carelessly about others (Ps. 69:13[12]), leads to loss of one's faculties (as Eli suspects of Hannah: 1 S. 1:13-15). A person who is totally drunk serves as a symbol of the helpless, disoriented fool, lost in his own wisdom (e.g., Job 12:25; Isa. 19:13-14; Nah. 3:11).

Three passages, difficult to interpret, associate drinking with nudity. In Gen. 9:21-22 many exegetes conjecture a sexual offense on the part of Ham against drunken Noah or Noah's wife,[16] although the text says nothing explicit of such an offense. In a bitterly ironic passage calling on Edom to rejoice (actually a threat), Lam. 4:21 promises a drinking bout that will lead to self-exposure. "Possibly the notion goes back to archaic forms of ordeal."[17] Hab. 2:15, which is textually uncertain, may be an attack on the luxurious banquets of Alexander the Great, in which nudity played a role.[18] The common element linking these three passages is probably disgrace due to overindulgence in alcohol.

Alcohol loosens moral restraints. David depends on this effect when he cunningly makes Uriah drunk so as to steer him to Bathsheba's bed (2 S. 11:13) — but to no avail. Addiction to wine and beer is a mark of false priests and prophets (Isa. 28:7; Mic. 2:11) as well as of corrupt and worthless civil servants, who arraign themselves with their own drinking song: "Let us fill ourselves with beer . . ." (Isa. 56:12).

These groups of "topers" are attacked by the prophetic woe oracles over those "who rise early in the morning in pursuit of strong drink," who are "heroes in drinking wine" (Isa. 5:11,22).

15. See esp. O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. tr. 1994), 167.
16. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 487-88.
17. H. J. Boecker, *Klagelieder. ZBK* 21 (1985), 85.
18. W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten. HKAT* III/4 (^{3}1922), 274-75.

V. Theological Usage. Sobriety is demanded of those who would approach Yahweh; the priests in particular are forbidden on pain of death to drink when they are performing their duties (Lev. 10:9; cf. also Eli's reprimand of Hannah in 1 S. 1:13-14). Therefore Israel came to know Yahweh in the wilderness, where there was no strong drink (Dt. 29:5[6]).

A critical attitude toward alcohol is reflected in two institutions that explicitly disdain intoxicating beverages: the nazirites (Nu. 6:1-20) abjure all alcohol (among other things) during the period of their vows;[19] the Rechabites (see esp. Jer. 35) eschew all marks of civilization: they do not build houses, engage in agriculture, or own land, but live in tents and abstain totally from alcohol. It may well be asked whether these institutions trace their ancestry to the nomadic prehistory of Israel. Since, however, the rule of the Rechabites is credited explicitly to Jonadab (Jer. 35:6), who lived in the 9th century (2 K. 10:15) and was a supporter of the Jehu revolution, it is more probable that it should be taken as an articulation of an anti-Canaanite protest movement. Such a movement, possibly in the context of the "Yahweh alone" movement, would deny the values of Canaanite religion, which was ecstatic in nature and heavily involved with such marks of civilization as wine. The goal of the Rechabites was to publicize and live the nomadic way of life as an ideal, but they were by no means of nomadic origin.[20]

Similarly, the first clear evidence for the Nazirites is of exilic or postexilic date (Nu. 6:11ff.: P); Am. 2:11-12 is Dtr;[21] and the date of the Samson story is uncertain, especially since abstention from alcohol is reported only for the pregnancy of his mother, not for Samson himself, whose status as a nazirite means only that he is forbidden to cut his hair (Jgs. 16:17; cf. the "unpruned vines" in Lev. 25:5,11). The common theory of an origin in the premonarchic institution of the holy war is dubious.[22] Is naziriteship possibly a confessional ritual comparable to Sabbath observance and circumcision, which did not come into practice until the exile and then experienced a steep rise?[23]

In contrast to these clear instances of cultic avoidance of alcohol, there is the practice of the drink offering (Nu. 28:7), which may have in its background the archaic notion of a "drink of the gods" (cf. also Jgs. 9:13).[24]

The overwhelming majority of the passages use "getting/making drunk" as a metaphor in the context of God's judgment. When God is hidden, people stagger like drunkards (Job 12:25). God's promise of disaster and a sense of the abuses that abound in Israel make the true prophet look like a trembling drunkard (Jer. 23:9). In the time of God's anger (at delayed rebuilding of the temple), people may drink, but there is not enough to make them drunk (Hag. 1:6). When God's judgment comes, there is no wine left (Joel 1:5) and the singing of the drunkards is stilled (Isa. 24:9). Instead — and now

19. → IX, 309-10.
20. R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 14-15.
21. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 170-71.
22. Cf. *AncIsr,* II, 466-67.
23. Cf. Mish. *Nazir.*
24. Herrmann.

each image is more horrible than the last — God's arrows are drunk with blood (Dt. 32:42), God turns Israel into a helpless victim, stupefied with drink (Isa. 29:9), which he himself destroys without mercy (Jer. 13:13-14); the enemy will be drunk on Israel's blood, or else Israel's enemies will be drunk on their own blood (Isa. 19:14; 28:1,3; 49:26; Jer. 48:26; 51:7) and drop into perpetual sleep (Jer. 51:39,57); animals will be drunk on the blood of those slaughtered by God (Ezk. 39:19). In the apocalyptic scenario of the eschaton, the earth will be drunk on the blood of those trampled and crushed by God (Isa. 63:6), the earth will stagger (Isa. 24:20). God forces people to drink the cup of his wrath (Jer. 25:27-28), the cup of horror and desolation (Ezk. 23:33).[25]

In the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah, the same image is used to summarize the end and reversal of God's judgment: "Therefore hear this, you poor, who are drunk, but not with wine. . . . See, I have taken from your hand the cup of staggering; you shall drink no more from the bowl of my wrath " (Isa. 51:21-22).

VI. LXX. The most important Greek counterpart to *škr* is *méthē*,[26] which is identical in meaning. Fourteen times *škr* is "translated" with *síkera,* which the LXX probably turned into a Semitic loanword. Rarely is *škr* translated by *oínos,* "wine" (Prov. 31:4), or *kraipalán,* "intoxicate" (Isa. 24:20; 29:9).

VII. Dead Sea Scrolls. The verb does not appear in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Its absence, however, is eloquent: there is no "drunkenness" in the community, with its priestly value system (cf. Lev. 10:9). The noun appears once, in the regulations governing the vintage festival (11QT 21:10). The text is clearly based on Nu. 28:7,[27] and *šēḵār* is explicated by *yayin ḥāḏāš.*

Oeming

25. → כוס *kôs.*

26. H. Preisker, "μέθη," *TDNT,* IV, 545-48.

27. See III above.

שֶׁלֶג *šeleg;* שׁלג *šlg*

I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls. II. 1. Snow as a Meteorological Phenomenon; 2. Yahweh and Snow; 3. Figurative Usage.

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The segholate *šeleg* is a primary noun derived from the basic form **šalg* (cf. Akk. *šalgu*[*m*]). The vb. *šālag,* which appears in the OT only in the hiphil, is a denominative.[1]

The root *šlg* with the basic meaning "snow" is Common Semitic. The noun is attested in Akkadian (*šalgu*[*m*]), Arabic *(ṯalǧ),* Egyptian (*śrk,* a Semitic loanword), Aramaic *(tᵉlag/talgā'),* Middle Hebrew, and Modern Hebrew; the verb is found in Arabic *(ṯalağa),* Syriac (*'aṯlēg,* "become white"), Aramaic (*tᵉlag,* "become white as snow"), Middle Hebrew,[2] and Modern Hebrew.[3]

Ugar. *gl̲ṯ* (6 occurrences to date as verb and noun) is probably a metathesized variant of *šlg*.[4] In each case the context suggests the meaning "snow."

On the basis of Job 9:30, a homonymous root *šeleg* II, "soapwort," related to Akk. *ašlāku(m)*,[5] "washerman," has been proposed;[6] this suggestion is unnecessary, however, since the *Ketib (bᵉmô-šeleg)* uses an image found also in Isa. 1:18 and Ps. 51:9(Eng. 7).[7]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *šeleg* occurs 20 times in the OT and twice in the Hebrew text of Sirach. Its frequent occurrence in wisdom literature (3 times in Proverbs, 5 times in Job), Isaiah (bis), and the Psalms (3 times) is striking. The denominative *šālag* occurs only in Ps. 68:15(14).

3. *LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.* The LXX translates *šeleg* 18 times with *chiṓn/chionoústhai,* once (Prov. 26:1) with *drósos,* "dew" (incorrectly simplifying the text), and twice (Job 24:19; Prov. 31:21) not at all, diverging markedly from the MT. The Tgs. always translate *šeleg* with *talgā' (tilgā').*

šeleg. K. Aartun, "Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon," *WO* 4 (1967/68) 278-99, esp. 280-81; G. Dalman, *AuS,* I/1 (1928), esp. 229-38; M. C. A. Korpel, "A Rift in the Clouds," *UBL* 8 (1990) 560-61, 594-610; B. Lang, "Vorläufer von Speiseeis in Bibel und Orient," in A. Caquot and M. Delcor, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 219-32; M. Noth, *OT World* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1966), esp. 31; H. Graf Reventlow, "Schnee," *BHHW,* III, 1709-10; B. van de Walle, "Schnee," *LexÄg,* V, 672-73.

1. *HAL,* II, 1502.
2. *WTM,* IV, 557.
3. For additional citations see *HAL,* II, 1502-3.
4. *CML*², 144; Aartun, 280-81. On the phenomenon of metathesis see *VG,* I, §98.
5. *AHw,* I, 81.
6. *KBL*², 972.
7. F. Horst, *Hiob 1–19. BK* XVI/1 (³1974), 152; contra G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 199, 211-12.

There are two possible occurrences of the root in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Decipherment of 4Q381 14 2 is difficult, but *šlg* is appropriate in a series that includes *'nn, 'b,* and *brd* (cf. the same series in Sir. 43:6-11).[8] Decipherment of 4Q186 2 2:3 is hardly possible; the context is totally unreadable.[9]

II. Snow as a Meteorological Phenomenon. Although snow is rare in Israel and the surrounding region, it is well known as a meteorological phenomenon. The snow season (with one to three days of snowfall each year on the average) extends from the end of November to the beginning of April. The accumulation is usually only a few inches, but on rare occasions may exceed twenty inches. Snow is exceptional in the valleys; statistically, even the hill country goes without snow one year in three.[10] "Perpetual" snow — or at least snow that remains visible well beyond winter — is found only on Mt. Hermon and the Lebanon (Jer. 18:14).[11]

Snow is an unusual and striking phenomenon. OT usage reflects its exceptional nature: it appears primarily in similes and metaphors. Only two passages speak of snow as an historical event.

Ps. 68:15(14) incorporates an untraceable — and therefore probably historically reliable — tradition: "When *šadday* scattered kings in it [the *naḥ^{a}lâ,* v. 10(9)? cf. *bâ,* v. 11(10)], snow fell [*tašlēg*[12]] on Zalmon[?]." The location of Zalmon (near Shechem? cf. Jgs. 9:48) remains as uncertain as the reconstruction of the event. Nevertheless, the difficult text should not be emended or interpreted in the light of v. 14(13), which is even more difficult.[13] Are we dealing with a fragment of tradition that defies interpretation because it has left no other literary traces — unlike vv. 13,14a(12,13a)(cf. Jgs. 5)? In any case the snowfall appears to have been understood as a concomitant of a theophany (cf. vv. 5,8-9,10[4,7-8,9]; Job 38:22-23).[14]

The anecdote in 2 S. 23:20 (//1 Ch. 11:22) records an extraordinary event: it was Benaiah, one of David's thirty mighty men, "who went down and killed the lion in the cistern on the day of snowfall [*b^{e}yôm haššāleḡ*]." Naturally news of such a deed soon got around (note the definite articles).

A heavy snowfall can also pose a danger to human life.[15] But the capable wife "is not afraid for her house[hold] when it snows, for all her house is clothed in crimson" (Prov. 31:21). Here it is probably the color of the bright crimson *(šānîm)* clothing that stands in poetic contrast to the white snow (cf. Isa. 1:18).

Prov. 25:13 provides evidence that snow could be a kind of "ice cream":[16] "Like the

---

8. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 92-93.

9. J. M. Allegro, *DJD,* V (1968), 91.

10. For details see *AuS,* I/1, 221-34.

11. On the derivation of "Lebanon" from *lbn* → לְבָנוֹן *l^{e}ḇānôn.*

12. *HAL,* II, 1502-3.

13. E. Lipiński, *VT* 23 (1973) 365-68.

14. See also II.2 below.

15. *AuS,* I/1, 232-33.

16. Lang.

cold snow in time of harvest, so is the faithful messenger to the one who sent him; he satisfies the craving of his master." Snow in harvest time (from the Lebanon? cf. Jer 18:14) can hardly have been available to anyone who wanted it, but most likely only to upper-class epicures. A snowfall is ruled out on meteorological grounds (cf. Prov. 26:1), and form-critical considerations rule out an unfulfillable craving.

2. *Yahweh and Snow.* When wisdom ponders the multiplicity of phenomena and comes to snow, following the model of Egyptian lists,[17] it also envisions its creator: "Fire and hail, snow and smoke[!]" glorify Yahweh (Ps. 148:8); for it is Yahweh who "gives snow like wool" (147:16) and "says to the snow, 'Fall on the earth'" (Job 37:6). The significance of such statements is especially clear against the background of Ugaritic mythology, where snow — like rain[18] — is the gift of Baal: "The time of his rain *(mṭrh),* Baal appoints the time, the time of wandering[?] in the snow *(bgl̲t)*."[19] Fire *(išt),* on the contrary, is personified as an enemy of Baal.[20] Thus words like those in Ps. 148 reveal a characteristic feature of the OT: the exclusivity of its faith, which sees the work of the one God even in the conflicting phenomena of nature (fire/hail; snow/smoke).

Job 38:22 incorporates the notion — already familiar at Ugarit — that the snow is kept in storehouses (*'ōṣᵉrôṯ šeleg;* Ugar. *iṣr*).[21] According to v. 23, Yahweh reserves snow and hail in these storehouses "for the time of trouble, for the day of battle and war" (cf. Ps. 68:15[14]).

3. *Figurative Usage.* Usually *šeleg* appears in similes and metaphors. It is characteristic that 9 of its 21 occurrences are formulated explicitly as comparisons, using the expression *kaššeleg,* "as snow," or *miššeleg,* "than snow." In this usage *šeleg* has no inherent positive or negative connotations. Sapiential similes drawn from nature appear in Prov. 26:1 ("Like snow in summer or rain in harvest, so honor is not fitting for a fool"); 25:13;[22] Job 24:19 ("Drought and heat snatch away the snow waters, as does Sheol those who have sinned"); and — in a similar vein — Job 6:16.

Here, too, probably belong the prophetic texts Isa. 1:18; Jer. 18:14; Isa. 55:10, which respond to the objections of their hearers and cite natural phenomena in an appeal to understanding. In a rhetorical question Isa. 1:18 points out the impossibility of repentance and return: "If your sins are like scarlet, can they become white as snow?"[23] This image

17. See the Onomasticon of Amenemope and its discussion by G. von Rad, "Job XXXVIII and Ancient Egyptian Wisdom," *Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. tr. New York, 1966), 281-91.

18. → מטר *māṭār.*

19. *KTU* 1.4, V, 6-7; cf. Korpel, 594-610.

20. *KTU* 1.3, III, 45.

21. See the reconstruction of *KTU* 1.4, VII, 59-60, by J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Semitic Study Series VI* (1987), 28.127; also Korpel, 302.

22. See II.1 above.

23. W. H. Schmidt, *Zukunfstgewissheit und Gegenwartskritik. BSt* 64 (1973), 44-45.

is taken up in Job 9:30; Lam. 4:7; and — as a petition — in Ps. 51:9(7). One searches in vain for a parallel in nature to Israel's "forgetting" of Yahweh; or "does . . . the snow of Lebanon vanish away?" (Jer. 18:14).[24] Not so the word of Yahweh: it accomplishes its purpose and affects Israel "as the rain and snow come down from heaven" (Isa. 55:10; cf. Ps. 147:15-16).

Three texts use the expression *kaššeleg* to describe a severe skin disorder: Moses' hand (Ex. 4:6), Miriam (Nu. 12:10), and Elisha's servant Gehazi (2 K. 5:27) become *m^eṣōrā'(-a'aṯ) kaššāleg,* "leprous as snow." The formula suggests a squamous or (more likely) white skin anomaly.[25]

Ernst

24. See II.1 above.
25. → צרעת *ṣāra'aṯ.*

שָׁלָה *šālâ;* שַׁלְוָה *šalwâ;* שָׁלֵו *šālēw;* שָׁלו *šālû*

I. Cognates. II. Occurrences: 1. Hebrew; 2. Aramaic. III. Meaning. IV. Secular Usage. V. Theological Usage. VI. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Cognates. An Akkadian verb, *šelû* IV, "be(come) negligent, neglect," may derive from Aram. *š^elî/ā.*[1] From this verb is derived the noun *šilûtu/šilītu* II, "negligence."[2] In Aramaic we find Old Aram. *šly,* "be quiet,"[3] appearing in the third Sefire inscription in the expression *šlw 'l 'šrkm,* "remain quietly in your place."[4] There is also Imperial Aram. *šlyh,* "ease," which appears in *Ahiqar* in the expression "allow yourself no ease."[5] The root also occurs in Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic, and various later dialects. In Ugaritic the root *šlw* is found in the Krt Epic, in the expression *'šlw bṣp 'nh,* "that I may find rest in the brightness of her eyes."[6]

1. *AHw,* III, 1211; cf. 1237.
2. *AHw,* III, 1237.
3. *DISO,* 302.
4. *KAI* 224.5.
5. Ahiqar 56, I, 5; see I. Kottsieper, *Die Sprache der Aḥiqarsprüche. BZAW* 194 (1990), 235; cf. 159.
6. *KTU* 1.14, III, 45; see E. Verreet, *UF* 16 (1984) 313-14; cf. *WUS,* no. 2609; *CML*², 86.

II. Occurrences.

1. *Hebrew.* The qal of *šlh* occurs in Jer. 12:1; Ps. 122:6; Job 3:26; 12:6; and Lam. 1:5. (In Job 27:8 MT *yšl* is probably incorrect, even if it is related to a root *šlh* II, "draw [out]";[7] the correct reading is probably *yś'*, "when God takes away his life."[8]) The niphal of the verb occurs in 2 Ch. 29:11, the hiphil in 2 K. 4:28.

The commonest derivatives are the noun *šalwâ,* found in Jer. 22:21; Ezk. 16:49; Ps. 122:7; Prov. 1:32; 17:1; Job 20:20;[9] Dnl. 8:25; 11:21,24; Sir. 47:13 (*ymy šlwh*), and the adj. *šālēw,* found in Jer. 49:31; Zec. 7:7; Ps. 73:12; Job 16:12; 21:23; 1 Ch. 4:40.

Ezk. 23:42 is problematic. The MT reads *wᵉqôl hāmôn šālēw bâ,* "and the noise of a carefree multitude is in her"; but the LXX translation, "with voices in unison they began to sing," presupposes a verb, e.g., *šārû.* Some prefer to emend the text;[10] NRSV retains the MT. In Job 20:20 *šalwâ* should be read, since the adjective makes no sense in the context.

In addition, a noun **šālû* occurs in Ps. 30:7(Eng. 6)[11] and a noun *šᵉlî* in 2 S. 3:27. Whether *šilyâ,* "afterbirth," in Dt. 28:57 is connected with the root *šlh* is questionable.[12] Neh. 3:15 contains the PN *šallûn,* unless the reading *šallûm,* found in many manuscripts, is correct.

2. *Aramaic.* In the Aramaic portions of the OT, the noun *šᵉlēwâ* (or *šᵉlēwā'*[13]) occurs in Dnl. 4:24(27), the adj. *šᵉlēh* in Dnl. 4:1(4), and the noun *šālû* in Dnl. 3:29*(Q);* 6:5(4); Ezr. 4:22; 6:9.

III. Meaning. The meaning of the original *tertiae waw* root[14] revolves around the concept of "rest, ease" (cf. the par. *nwḥ* and its lexical field[15]). In the qal the verb means "be at ease"; the adjective means "quiet, calm, carefree." The two nouns have the basic meaning "rest, tranquility, ease." The expression *bᵉšalwâ* in Dnl. 8:25; 11:21,24 should be translated "unexpectedly, without warning."[16] In the Aramaic OT the adj. *šᵉlēh* means "at ease" and the noun *šᵉlēwâ* "peace and quiet"; the four occurrences of *šālû* mean "laxity, carelessness" (or even "transgression").

IV. Secular Usage. The earliest instance of secular usage of the root is in 2 S. 3:27: when Abner returns to Hebron, Joab takes him aside in the gateway to speak with him *bišlî,* "quietly," i.e., "in private" — and then avenges his brother. Also secular are the passages where Aram. *šālû* means "negligence." In Dnl. 6:5(4) the high officials are

7. *GesB,* 829.
8. G. Fohrer, *Hiob, KAT* XVI (1963), 386.
9. See below.
10. E.g., W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 478.
11. Even-Shoshan, 2131, 2144: *šelew.*
12. *HAL,* II, 1524.
13. *GesB,* 927.
14. Meyer, II, §52.4a, etc.
15. → IX, 278.
16. Most modern comms., following KD, *Daniel,* 318, 451-52.

looking for grounds for complaint against Daniel, but cannot find any negligence. In Ezr. 4:22 Artaxerxes orders Rehum the royal deputy and Shimshai the scribe to prevent the rebuilding of Jerusalem's walls and not to be negligent in doing so. The point of 6:9 is that the regime is to provide everything needed for the sacrificial cult without neglect. The connotation of negligence may also be present in Jer. 49:31, where Nebuchadrezzar calls the Arabian tribes "a nation at ease, that lives secure . . . , that has no gates or bars, that lives alone." A nation so unprotected is naturally easy prey, notwithstanding the fact that the mutually interpretive terms *bdd, bṭḥ,* and *šālēw* appear at first glance to have positive connotations (cf. Nu. 23:9 and above all Jgs. 18:7, albeit without *šālēw*).[17]

Dnl. 3:29 is ambiguous: does the text refer to negligence toward the God of the men in the fiery furnace or to deliberate blasphemy?

Also secular is the usage of *šlw* in Dnl. 8:25; 11:21,24, where *b^ešalwâ* means "without warning." Here the vision and its interpretation refer to the manner in which Antiochus IV seizes power, bringing destruction on the land and on many of its inhabitants.

V. Theological Usage. The remaining occurrences of the root may be termed theological in the broadest sense. The first major group to emerge involves sapiential usage, above all in Proverbs, Job, and Ps. 73:12. The earliest such text is Prov. 17:1, where "a dry morsel with quiet" is preferred to "a house full of sacrificial flesh [NRSV: feasting] with strife." This text is not critical of the cult in a general sense, but focuses on the attitude of the worshiper vis-à-vis the cult: what good is sacrifice if one's own private life is in disarray? This view also appears to be articulated in Job 20:20. Because the wicked have no inner quiet, all their costly possessions cannot save them and give them true stability; they must perish in the end. Quiet is characterized here as a desirable blessing. It appears in the same light in 3:26, where Job bitterly laments the absence of the ease he longs for. In 16:12, too, Job notes the terrible discrepancy between his former ease and his present situation: God has seized him, dashed him to pieces, and set him up as a target (cf. also Sir. 41:1: how bitter is the thought of death to one who is living at ease). But Job's complaint goes further. It is not enough that, though just and blameless, he finds no ease; on the contrary, the tents of robbers are at peace and those who provoke God are secure (Job 12:6). This observation is a clear sign of the crisis of sapiential thought, which must concede that the order of the world no longer holds.

The agonized prophet asks a similar question in Jer. 12:1: "Why does the way of the guilty prosper, why do all who are treacherous thrive?" "The riddle of the felicity of the wicked . . . surfaces here in Jer. 12 for the first time in the literature of the OT,"[18] if in fact the prophet's confession dates from the end of the 6th century. The question is made even more acute by v. 2, which ascribes the prosperity of Jeremiah's opponents to Yahweh by describing them as having been planted by Yahweh. Finally, a similar

17. H.-J. Zobel, → I, 475-76.

18. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 85, citing Cornill.

idea appears in Ps. 73:12: "Such are the ways of the wicked: always at ease, they increase in riches." This statement concludes the section of this sapiential psalm that deals with the felicity of the wicked; it is finally annulled by the notion of translation to God's presence (v. 24).

In Prov. 1:32 ease in the sense of complacency receives a critical assessment: the complacency of fools destroys them. Here complacency clearly refers to inattentiveness toward wisdom teachers; for whoever listens to them is secure and at ease *(bāṭaḥ, ša'ᵃnān),* without dread of disaster. This critical undertone in the treatment of "unconcern" appears in a number of other texts. In Jer. 22:21 (the core of which is an authentic oracle of Jeremiah), Yahweh accuses King Jehoiachin of having refused to listen to him in the days when Jehoiachin had no cares. Similarly, Ezk. 16:49 (secondary) charges Jerusalem's sister Sodom with having neglected the socially disadvantaged in her pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease (*šalwaṯ hašqēṭ; šqṭ* also appears with *šālēw/šlh* in Job 3:26; 1 Ch. 4:40).

Ps. 30:7(6) speaks in a somewhat different vein: "I said in my unconcern [NRSV: prosperity], I shall never be moved." Here we are not dealing with a specific type of wickedness, but with "a form of self-glorification that will not acknowledge the glory bestowed by Yahweh as the foundation of existence."[19] The same idea is present in 2 Ch. 29:11. Here Hezekiah admonishes the priests and Levites not to be overly carefree in carrying out their ministry and rest on their laurels because they have been chosen[20] by Yahweh. "That the warning is not superfluous is shown by v. 34 and by 30:3,15."[21]

In speaking with Elisha, the Shunammite woman guards against a false sense of security or hope (*šlh* hiphil) with respect to the gift of a son (2 K. 4:28). She had not asked for a child; if the child is now taken from her, Elisha's credibility will be gone.[22]

Finally, we must consider whether the notion of ease might be an element of Jerusalemite theology. Ps. 122:6-7 and Zec. 7:7 suggest this possibility; Lam. 1:5; Jer. 22:21; and 2 Ch. 29:11, as well as Sir. 47:13, could point in the same direction. In Ps. 122:6-7 ease (in v. 6 the verb, unless the noun is to be read with LXX; in v. 7 the noun) parallels *šālôm,* "salvation, peace": "Wish Jerusalem *šālôm,* may they be at ease who love you; *šālôm* be within your walls, ease in your residence towers." Here the blessing formula of this pilgrimage song plays on the words *šālôm* and *šalwâ,*[23] although they are etymologically unrelated. In Zec. 7:7 the early postexilic prophet speaks of a time in the past when Jerusalem was still inhabited and at ease. The oracle describes this time — the time of the great prophets — as a time of salvation and prosperity (cf. the description of the land of the Simeonites in 1 Ch. 4:40 as quiet and peaceful). This time is clearly past when Lam. 1:5 laments that it is now the enemies of Jerusalem who are at ease, and there can be no doubt that Yahweh brought this disaster upon his city for

---

19. H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. FRLANT* 148 (1989), 259.
20. → בחר *bāḥar.*
21. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* 1/21 (1955), 295.
22. E. Würthwein, *Könige II: 1 Kön. 17–2 Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 293.
23. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 435.

her transgressions. Can this passage be thinking of Jehoiachin's carefree refusal to listen (Jer. 22:21)? Finally, Sir. 47:13, describing the reign of Solomon, connects the city of Jerusalem with the motif of ease.

VI. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX usually uses either *euthēneín* and its derivatives or *eirēneúein* and its derivatives to translate words based on the root **šlw*.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls the noun *šalwâ* appears in 1QH 12:2 as an equivalent to *šeqeṭ* and in 4Q503 69 1 as *nomen regens* in a construct phrase with *šeqeṭ*. The verb appears in 11QPs[a] 21:17 in a Hebrew version of Sir. 51:20, diverging from LXX.

Grünwaldt

שָׁלוֹם *šālôm*

I. The Word: 1. Etymology; 2. LXX; 3. Lexical Field. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Mesopotamia; 2. Egypt and Ḫatti; 3. Syria. III. OT: 1. Tetrateuch; 2. Deuteronomy, Dtr Literature, and Chr Literature; 3. Prophetic Literature; 4. Psalms and Wisdom Literature; 5. Aramaic; 6. Proper Names. IV. Derivatives. V. Deuterocanonical Literature. VI. Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Judaism.

šālôm. R. Albertz, "Schalom und Versöhnung," *Theologia Practica* 18 (1983) 16-29; idem and H. Frankemölle, "Friede," *NBL,* I, 706-8, with bibliog.; W. F. Albright, "The Syro-Mesopotamian God Šulmân Ešmûn and Related Figures," *AfO* 7 (1931/32) 164-69; H. Baarlink, *Vrede op aarde. Exegetische Studies* 2 (Kampen, 1985); R. Bach, ". . . der Bogen zerbricht, Spiesse zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt," in H. H. Wolff, ed., *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 13-26, esp. 23-26; L. Barrett, *The Way God Fights* (Scottdale, 1987); B. F. Batto, "The Covenant of Peace," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 187-211; A. Bea, "L'idea della pace nel Vecchio Testamento," *XXXV. Congresso Eucharistico Internationale* (Barcelona, 1953), 49-59; G. Braulik, "Some Remarks on the Deuteronomistic Conception of Freedom and Peace," *Theology of Deuteronomy* (Eng. tr. North Richland Hills, 1994), 87-98; J. P. Brown, "Peace Symbolism in Ancient Military Vocabulary," *VT* 21 (1971) 1-24; R. A. Caminos, "Grussformeln," *LexÄg,* II, 915-17; G. Cañellas, "Paz (shalom) en el AT; profetas," *Olivo* 14 (1981) 49-78; W. Caspari, *Der biblische Friedensgedanke nach dem AT. Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen* 10/7 (1916); idem, *Vorstellung und Wort "Friede" im AT. BFCT* 14/4 (1910); W. T. W. Cloete, *"ntn yhwh šālôm,"* in F. E. Deist and J. A. Loader, eds., *Papers Read at the 24th Meeting of the OTWSA* (Pretoria, 1982) 1-10; P. C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the OT* (1978); M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 359; W. Dietrich, "Ungesicherter Friede?" *ZEE* 31 (1987) 134-61; E. Dinkler, "Friede," *RAC,* VIII, 434-505, esp. 448-53; U. Duchrow and G. Liedke, *Shalom* (Eng. tr. Geneva, 1989); J. I. Durham, "שָׁלוֹם and the Presence of God," in J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter, eds., *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (Richmond, 1970), 272-93; W. Eichrodt, *Die Hoffnung des ewigen Friedens im alten Israel. BFCT* 25/3 (1920); W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel* שלם *im AT. BZAW* 113 (1969); D. Elgavish, *Milḥemet w[e]šalom* (Ramar-Gan, 1978); J. J. Enz, *The Christian and Warfare. Christian Peace Shelf Series* (Scottdale, 1972); G. Fitzer, "Friede," *BHHW,* I, 500;

W. Foerster, "εἰρήνη in the LXX," *TDNT,* II, 406-8; idem, "שָׁלוֹם in Rabbinic Writings," *TDNT,* II, 408-10; G. Fohrer, "Zion-Jerusalem in the OT," *TDNT,* VII, 293-319; I. Gabriel, *Friede über Israel. ÖBS* 10 (1990); G. Gerleman, "שׁלם *šlm* to have enough," *TLOT,* III, 1337-48; idem, "Die Wurzel *šlm,*" *ZAW* 85 (1973) 1-14; N. N. Glatzer, "The Concept of Peace in Classical Judaism," in E. Fromm et al., eds., *Die Friede. FS A. Leschnitzer* (Heidelberg, 1961), 27-38; E. M. Good, "Peace in the OT," *IDB,* III, 704-6; H. Grapow, *Wie die alten Ägypter sich anredeten, wie sie sich grüssten und wie sie miteinander sprachen. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft* 26 ([2]1960); J. Gray, "The Desert God ʿAṮR in the Literature and Religion of Canaan," *JNES* 8 (1949) 72-83; H. Gross, "Peace," in J. B. Bauer, ed., *Sacramentum Verbi,* 3 vols. (Eng. tr. New York, 1970), II, 648-51; idem, *Die Idee des ewigen und allgemeinen Weltfriedens im Alten Orient und im AT. TrThSt* 7 ([2]1967); P. D. Hanson, "War, Peace and Justice in Early Israel," *BRev* 3 (1987) 32-45; D. J. Harris, *Shalom* (Grand Rapids, 1970); B. Hartmann, "Mögen die Götter Dich behüten und unversehrt bewahren," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 102-5; D. K. Hayes, "Shalom," *Clergy Review* 71 (1986) 429-34; W. Helck, "Frieden," *LexÄg,* II, 331; G. Heleva, "'Pace' e 'guerra' nella teologia israelitica dell'alleanza," in M. Sordi, ed., *La pace nell mondo antico. Scienze storiche* 36 (Mailand, 1985), 513-28; J. Hempel, *Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen. BZAW* 81 (1961), 30-113; L. Hoppe, *"šālôm," Bible Today* 21 (1983) 202; F. Horst, "Segen und Segenshandlungen in der Bibel," *EvT* 7 (1947/48) 23-37 = *ThB* 12 (1961), 188-202, esp. 194-97; E. Jenni, "'Gehe hin in Frieden *(lšlwm/bšlwm)!*'" *ZAH* 1 (1988) 40-46; I. Johag, "טוב — Terminus Technicus in Vertrags- und Bündnisformularen des alten Orients und des AT," in H.-J. Fabry, ed., *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 3-23, esp. 19-20; A. S. Kapelrud, "Frelse i Det Gamle testamente," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 80 (1979) 139-59; N. Klaus, "The Blessing *šālôm* in the Bible," *BethM* 31 (1985/86) 252-67; H.-J. Kraus, "Zur Aktualität der biblischen Schalom-Botschaft," in H. Deuser et al., eds., *Gottes Zukunft, Zukunft der Welt. FS J. Moltmann* (Munich, 1986), 365-73; A. L. Kristensen, "Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas," *UF* 9 (1977) 143-58; A. G. Lamadrid, "Pax et bonum," *EstB* 28 (1969) 61-77; idem, "Pax et bonum," *Antonianum* 44 (1969) 161-81; I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949), esp. 3-9; P. Lapide, "Zukunftserwartung und Frieden im Judentum," in G. Liedke, *Eschatologie und Frieden,* II (Stuttgart, 1978), 127-78; J. Lewy, "The Šulmān Temple in Jerusalem," *JBL* 59 (1940) 519-22; F. M. T. de Liagre Böhl, "Älteste keilschriftliche Erwähungen der Stadt Jerusalem und ihrer Göttin?" *AcOr* 1 (1922) 76-80 = *Opera minora* (Groningen, 1953), 380-83, 517-18; G. Liedke, ed., *Frieden — Bibel — Kirche. Studien zur Friedensforschung* 9 (Stuttgart, 1972); S. E. Loewenstamm, "Ugaritic Formulas of Greeting," *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 362-65 (repr. from *BASOR* 194 [1969] 52-55); U. Luz et al., *Eschatologie und Friedenshandeln. SBS* 101 (1981); C. Mackay, "Salem," *PEQ* 80/81 (1948/49) 121-30; M. A. Martín Juárez, "La paz," *Biblia y Fe* 17 (1991) 5-28; D. E. Nale, "Peace" (diss., Dallas, 1987); J. Nibel, *Der Friedensgedanke des AT* (1914); M. Noth, "OT Covenant-making in the Light of a Text from Mari," *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1967), 108-17; H. S. Nyberg, "Studien zum Religionskampf im AT," *ARW* 35 (1938) 329-87; H. van Oyen, "Schalom," in J. J. Stamm and E. Jenni, eds., *Wort, Gebot, Glaube. FS W. Eichrodt. ATANT* 59 (1970), 157-70; L. M. Pákozdy, "Der Begriff 'Frieden' im AT und sein Verhältnis zum Kampf," *CV* 14 (1971) 253-66; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-IV; N. Peters, *Weltfriede und Propheten* (Paderborn, 1917); M. H. Pope, *"šaḥr* und *šalim," WbMyth,* I, 306-7; N. W. Porteous, "Jerusalem-Zion," in A. Kuschke, ed., *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 235-52; G. von Rad, "שָׁלוֹם in the OT," *TDNT,* II, 402-6; G. Ravasi, "Shalom e eirene," *Parole de vita* 30 (1985) 9-16; A. Ravitzky, "The Term Shalom in Jewish Thought," *Daat* 17 (1986) V, 5-22; F. V. Reiterer, *Gerechtigkeit als Heil* (Graz, 1976); H. Graf Reventlow, "Friedensvorstellungen im Alten und im NT," *Friede über Israel* 62 (1979), 99-109, 147-53;

I. The Word.

1. *Etymology.* The noun *šālôm* occurs 237 times in the Hebrew OT.[1] The root *šlm* is attested since the earliest times in all branches of Semitic,[2] in a wealth of forms with a broad range of meanings. "The semantic range of *šlm,* which exhibits remarkably constant elements in various times and languages, suggests that it involves an elemental aspect of human life whose linguistic designation may not be further derived."[3] The attempt of Torczyner to trace an etymological connection between *šlm* and *šlh,* "be at ease, be calm," should therefore be met with caution.[4]

Whether the root *šlm* in Hebrew is based on a nominal or verbal concept is disputed. Earlier scholarship treated *šālôm* as an underivable primary noun of the *qaṭāl* type;[5] Eisenbeis, too, sees in *šālôm* a primary noun, from which the adjective *šālēm* is proba-

---

G. Rinaldi, "*šālôm,*" *BiOr* 11 (1969) 108; 23 (1981) 166; L. Rost, "Erwägungen zum Begriff *šālôm,*" in K. H. Bernhardt, ed., *Schalom. FS A. Jepsen. AzT* I/46 (1971) 41-44; E. Ruprecht, "Das Nilpferd im Hiobbuch," *VT* 21 (1971) 209-31, esp. 224-26; E. Salonen, "Gruss," *RLA,* III, 668-70; idem, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen. StOr* 38 (1967); J. Scharbert, "ŠLM im AT," in H. Gross and F. Mussner, eds., *Lex tua veritas. FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 209-29 = K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des AT. WdF* 125 (1972), 300-324; H. H. Schmid, "Frieden II, AT," *TRE,* XI, 605-10; idem, *Frieden ohne Illusion* (Zurich, 1971); idem, *šalôm "Frieden" im alten Orient und im AT. SBS* 51 (1971); H. P. Schmidt, *Frieden. Themen der Theologie* 3 (1969); idem, "Schalom," in H. E. Bahr, ed., *Weltfrieden und Revolution* (Reinbek, 1968), 185-235; H.-H. Schrey, "Friede," *RGG*[3], II, 1133-35; F. L. Shuts, "שלם and תמם in Biblical Hebrew" (diss., Austin, TX, 1974); R. H. Smith, "Abram and Melchizedek," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 129-53; T. Sorg, "Die Bibel zum Thema Frieden," *Theologische Beiträge* 12 (1981) 254-67; J. J. Stamm, "Friedenfürst," *BHHW,* I, 500-501; idem, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," in E. Jenni and M. A. Klopfenstein, eds., *Beiträge zur hebräische und altorientalische Namenkunde. FS J. J. Stamm. OBO* 30 (1980), 59-79; idem, "Der Name des Königs Salomo," *TZ* 16 (1960) 285-97; idem and H. Bietenhard, *Der Weltfriede im Licht der Bibel* (Zurich, 1959); O. H. Steck, *Friedensvorstellungen im alten Jerusalem. ThS* 111 (1972); F. J. Stendebach, "'Ganzheit' oder 'Genüge'? Vorarbeiten zum Artikel *šālôm* im *ThWAT,*" in J. Zmijewski, ed., *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung. FS H. Reinelt* (Stuttgart, 1990), 329-44; F. Stolz, *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem. BZAW* 118 (1970); W. Thiel, "Aspekte des Friedens im AT," in K.-W. Tröger, ed., *Nachfolge und Friedensdienst* (Berlin, 1983), 12-23; W. Thiessen, "Frieden III, Judentum," *TRE,* XI, 610-13; H. E. Tödt, "Biblische Botschaft und moderne Friedenskonzepte," in G. Liedke, ed., *Eschatologie und Frieden,* II (1978), 333-92; W. Towner, "Tribulation and Peace," *HBT* 6/2 (1984) 1-26; J. P. Weinberg, "Krieg und Frieden im Weltbild des Chronisten," *OLP* 16 (1985) 116-21; M. Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the OT and in the Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90 (1970) 184-203; C. Westermann, "Frieden," in idem, ed., *Theologie: VI x 12 Hauptbegriffe* (1967), 58-63; idem, "Der Frieden *(shalom)* im AT," *Forschung am AT, II. ThB* 55 (1974), 196-229 (repr. from G. Picht and H. E. Tödt, eds., *Studien zur Friedensforschung,* I [1969], 144-77); idem, "Shalom," *Quatember* 1966/67, 1-7; D. J. Wiseman, "'Is It Peace?'" *VT* 32 (1982) 311-26; P. B. Yoder, *Shalom, the Bible's Word for Salvation, Justice, and Peace* (Newton, 1987).

1. *HAL,* II, 1506.
2. G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. tr. Winona Lake, 1983), 220-21.
3. Gerleman, *TLOT,* III, 1137-38.
4. H. Torczyner, *Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus,* I (Vienna, 1916), 243.
5. *BLe,* §60c.

bly derived.[6] Jenni, however, understands *šālôm* as a verbal noun related to the stative vb. *šlm,* "be complete,"[7] more precisely "an abstract noun . . . , i.e., semantically a predicative utterance compressed into a noun, a qualitative abstract noun that conveys an . . . adjectival predication ('being *šālēm*')."[8]

In Ugaritic we find *šlm* I, "be intact, whole," D and Š stems "keep intact, requite"; *šlm* II, "peace"; *šlm* III, pl. *šlmm,* "peace offerings"; *šlm* IV, "sacrifice"; and *šlm* V, "paid, settled."[9] The root may also occur in Amorite.[10]

In Akkadian we find *salāmum* I, "friendliness" (Old Babylonian); *salāmu(m)* II, Neo-Bab. *selēmu* (*slm* being a secondary form of the root *šlm*), "be(come) friendly, peaceful" (also Bab. and Middle Assyr. *šalāmu, ṣalāmu* with the same meaning), D stem "make friendly, reconcile."[11] Other forms are: *salīmiš,* "in peace"; *salīmu(m),* "peace, friendship";[12] *šalāmu* I, "prosperity, peace"; *šalāmu(m)* II, "be(come) intact, whole, well, succeed, return whole, be(come) complete, perfect, survive, be satisfied with, receive complete, be(come) favorable (of an omen)"; D stem "keep intact, complete, pay in full, tend, administer, make whole, bring safely, hand over complete, fill up, replace, restore, finish, completely, make ready, settle, fill a period of time";[13] also *šulmāniš,* "in peace"; *šulmānu,* "greeting, (official) gift, bribe"; *šulmu(m),* "intactness, wholeness, health, well-being, welfare, greeting, ruin, bubble (air bubble in oil, etc.)";[14] *sulumma'u(m),* "gesture of reconciliation, peace treaty, alliance."[15]

In Phoenician/Punic we find *šlm,*[16] which also serves as an element of personal names.[17]

In Aramaic the noun is *šᵉlām.* In the peal the verb *šlm* means "be whole, intact," in the pael "make whole, complete, settle, make reparation, pay,"[18] in the haphel "return, surrender."[19] The lexeme first appears in an Aramaic letter from Ashur,[20] then in the Aramaic ideograms in Middle Persian,[21] and finally in Egyptian Aramaic,[22] Naba-

---

6. Pp. 52, 55.
7. Cf. *HAL,* II, 1507.
8. Jenni, 42-43.
9. *WUS,* nos. 2614-16; *UT,* no. 2424.
10. *APNM,* 247.
11. *AHw,* II, 1013-14.
12. *AHw,* II, 1015-16.
13. *AHw,* III, 1143-45.
14. *AHw,* III, 1268-69.
15. *AHw,* II, 1057.
16. *DISO,* 303-5.
17. Benz, 418.
18. Eisenbeis, 46-48.
19. Lisowsky, 1574.
20. M. Lidzbarski, *WVDOG* 38 (²1970) 8 (l. 1); A. Dupont-Sommer, *Syr* 24 (1944/45) 24-61.
21. H. F. J. Junker, ed., *The Frahang i Pahlavík* (Leipzig, 1912); E. Ebeling, *MAOG* 14/1 (1941).
22. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century* B.C. (Oxford, 1957), 104.

tean,[23] Palmyrene, Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan, and Mandaic.[24] We may also cite Arab. *salāmān,* the name of a tree.[25]

In Syriac the root appears in the lexemes *šalmûṯā',* "completeness, perfection, harmony, consummation (sex act)"; *šᵉlāmā',* "peace, intactness, health, welfare"; *šālāmîṯā',* "concord"; *šalmānûṯā',* "completeness, perfection"; *šulmānā',* "completeness, fulfillment"; *šalmā',* "whole, intact"; *šulāmā',* "completeness, fullness"; *šᵉlamlᵉmûṯā',* "intactness, wholeness, perfection."[26]

Old South Arabic has *slm,* "peace."[27] In Ethiopic we find *salâm,* "intactness, health, well-being, greeting, agreement, peace, ease, security, welfare"; *salāmāwī,* "peaceful, making peace"; *salama,* "be whole, intact, well"; *tasālama,* "make peace, maintain peace, exchange loud greetings"; *'astasālama,* "make peace, reconcile, restore, make reparations, restore friendship, decide."[28] In Tigre we find *salâm, salâmat,* "greeting."[29]

Arabic has *salm/silm,*[30] "peace, reconciliation, submission, subjection" (cf. the term "Islam"), "a person who lives in harmony with others";[31] also *salām,* "intactness, wholeness, welfare, peace, security."[32] We may also note the PN *sulaimān.*[33]

In Egyptian a Semitic loanword *šrm* is found, with the meaning "welfare."[34]

A survey of the palette of meanings conveyed by the root *šlm* makes one skeptical of Eisenbeis's attempt to identify a basic notion of "wholeness" behind all the individual meanings. He claims that "wholeness" denotes a situation "in which the entity, situation, or person appears to manifest itself in its own particular uniqueness," a static norm (except in Arabic), "a formal given accessible to detached observation," but in Arabic something dynamic, "based on participation in reality by virtue of empirical knowledge."[35] This wholeness is to be understood as "a formal structure that can be imbued with a variety of content," a "normative or relational concept."[36] One may ask whether such a definition can do justice to the multiplicity of particular contexts or, on the contrary, the concrete individual meanings are being forcibly constrained to fit within a single concept.

Taking as a starting point the piel of the vb. *šlm,* which can be translated "give back,

---

23. J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen,* II (Paris, 1932), 150-51.
24. M. Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer,* I (Giessen, 1905); II (1915), 46, 74; *KBL*², 1131.
25. *KBL*², 981.
26. Eisenbeis, 44-46.
27. ContiRossini, 196; Beeston, 126.
28. Eisenbeis, 49-50.
29. *TigrWb,* 168.
30. Lane, I/4, 1414; Wehr, 425.
31. Eisenbeis, 35.
32. Lane, I/4, 1415; Wehr, 425.
33. Wehr, 426.
34. *WbÄS,* IV, 528.
35. Eisenbeis, 50-51.
36. Ibid., 353, 355.

pay, settle, pay the penalty, replace, requite, pay back," some have sought to define the noun *šālôm* as denoting a state of equilibrium and contentment that often corresponds to our terms "peace" or "well-being."[37] Arguing on this basis, Gerleman comes to understand *šālôm* as "satisfaction, sufficiency," a term denoting the situation in which one has enough as well as whatever is sufficient or satisfactory; it is characteristic that *šālôm* "transcends the merely adequate, denoting rather plenitude, a 'sufficiency' measured by a full or copious measure."[38] If satisfaction is viewed as a process, the emphasis can rest on the act, the nature of the satisfaction offered. Then *šālôm* means "compact, agreement." If, on the contrary, the state established by the act of restitution is emphasized, the meaning of *šālôm* shifts in the direction of "peace," a state brought about by mutual contributions.[39] This analysis should be greeted with caution; the argument seems to me to rest on too narrow a base, and is therefore too forced.

Eisenbeis explicitly rejects the derivation of the noun *šālôm* from the piel of *šlm*.[40]

The understanding of *šālôm* as meaning "wholeness" was espoused long before and independently of Eisenbeis; he merely pushed this conception to its ultimate conclusion. To Pedersen, for example, *šālôm* means social harmony, free and unhampered growth, and the full manifestation of the soul; when souls are united, then their *šālôm* consists in their shared work on behalf of the common good. The noun denotes factual wholeness and one who is whole. It covers all kinds of felicity and free expansion, but its core is communion with others, the basis of life. Life, strength, and *šālôm* go together.[41] Pedersen's dependence here on a certain conception of "souls" that emerges from the study of comparative religion is all too clear.

Von Rad follows in Pedersen's footsteps. According to him, the basic meaning of *šālôm* is "welfare," with a clear bias to the material side: bodily health, prosperity, contentment. When *šālôm* is associated with a collective, it approximates the sense of "peace." It is important to observe that in a great number of passages *šālôm* implies less a state than a relationship (e.g., 1 K. 5:26[Eng. 12]). In these cases *šālôm* is clearly a social concept, as its association with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* and related lexemes also shows.[42] The noun *šālôm* means "the unimpairedness, the wholeness, of a relationship of communion, and so a state of harmonious equilibrium, the balancing of all claims and needs between two parties."[43] Among these interpretations, von Rad's position seems to me to do most justice to the meaning of *šālôm*. Above all — unlike Eisenbeis and Gerleman — he does not fix his gaze rigidly on a basic concept from which all instantiations and nuances are derived.

Westermann, who supports a derivation of the noun from the piel of *šlm*, defines *šālôm* as "completeness, wholeness, intactness," especially of a social group. In the

37. Scharbert, 212-13, 226.
38. Gerleman, "Wurzel," 8.
39. Gerleman, "Wurzel," 8-9; *TLOT*, III, 1343-44.
40. Pp. 356-57.
41. *ILC*, I-II, 263, 287, 311, 318.
42. Von Rad, *TDNT*, II, 402-3, 406.
43. G. von Rad, *OT Theology*, I (Eng. tr. New York, 1962), 130.

largest group of texts, *šālôm* means "prosperity, welfare" in a broad sense. It is correct to say that *šālôm* in the sense of "peace" in contrast to war represents a secondary semantic development. This change of meaning is due to the experience, over the course of history, that war interferes with the well-being of society, which was not true in the beginning.[44]

In this connection Albertz argues further that, in the course of the prophetic attack on those who claimed God's sanction for the wars of the monarchy, from the 8th century into the exilic period God was increasingly separated from war and associated with peace.[45] This development finally led to the conception of peace as a universal eschatological gift of God. Since *šālôm* at core denotes the welfare of the small social groups defined by families and villages, originally and generally it was not thought of as the opposite of war.[46]

Steck examines the connection between *šālôm* and the god *šālēm*, and reaches the following conclusion: *šālôm* means "a universal state of unimpaired well-being, above all within the political ambit of Jerusalem"; fertility and deliverance from the threat of foreign nations "were integral elements of the state of *šālôm* guaranteed and maintained by this deity."[47] Thus *šālôm* is "the ordered stability of the world, which benefits and promotes life."[48]

In the light of this survey, we can hardly evade the conclusion that *šālôm* has a semantic breadth that cannot be conveyed adequately by any single English word. "Wholeness" and "sufficiency" mark points on a continuum between which the meaning of *šālôm* flickers; it cannot be fixed at one point or the other. To put it another way: *šālôm* is a comprehensive expression denoting all that the people of ancient Near East wish for as the substance of blessing. "It is a state of being unimpaired and unthreatened, of ease and security, of felicity and wholeness in the broadest sense."[49]

In this context we should cite the suggestion of Noth that Heb. *šālôm* encompasses not only Akk. *šalāmu*, "well-being," but also the *salīmum* of the Mari texts, "reconciliation, agreement."[50] This theory could help explain the breadth of meaning of *šālôm*.

For the present we may conclude that *šālôm* is a profoundly positive concept associated with the notions of intactness, wholeness, and well-being, of the world and of humanity. It must be satisfied and restored when it is compromised or violated. Perhaps,

44. Westermann, *Forschung am AT*, 55, 199-200, 202-3, 215.

45. "Schalom," 18, with n. 8.

46. Ibid., p. 20; cf. also *NBL*, I, 706-8.

47. Pp. 26, 29.

48. On the interpretation of *šālôm* as "wholeness, well-being," see also Schrey, 1133; Fitzer, 500; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1966), 143; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1972), 194; G. Quell, *TDNT*, I, 235; II, 116, 179; Gross, "Friede," 436-37; L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1957), 203; A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1967), 4; idem, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, 1964), 104-5; H. H. Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung*. *BHT* 40 (1968), 68; Reiterer, 96; Durham, 276-77.

49. Hempel, 58-59.

50. Noth, 113.

with all due caution — and without venturing a fixed conceptual definition — we can say that *šālôm* denotes a supremely positive quality of being, which can be instantiated in the most various ways in various contexts. Thus Schmid rightly concludes that the OT concept of peace denotes "a state of the world that can be called unconditionally positive; it can refer not only to the political and military realm but also to the realms of law, the cult, social order, and even fertility. A stable order within these individual realms and also between these various realms makes life possible. Only when this order is in place can one speak of *šālôm,* 'peace.'"[51]

2. *LXX.* The LXX uses *eirḗnē* to translate almost all occurrences of *šālôm,* and only for this purpose. Thus the Greek word, which refers primarily to a state of quiet and calm, takes on the substance of *šālôm.*[52] On the other hand, the danger of a semantic constriction of the Hebrew concept is unmistakable.[53] In Gen. 26:31 and 28:21, *šālôm* is represented by *sōtēría,* and in Gen. 41:16 by *sōtḗrion;* in Gen. 29:6; 37:14; Josh. 10:21, we find *hygiaínein* or *hygiḗs;* the interrogative greeting in Gen. 43:7 is *pṓs échete;* in Ex. 18:7 *šā'al lᵉšālôm* is translated *aspázesthai* — to note only a few divergences. In other words, all that is constant is the use of *eirḗnē* to denote the *šālôm* bestowed on human beings by God. Aq., Symm., and Theod. also generally use *eirḗnē* to represent *šālôm.*[54]

The LXX translates the adj. *šālēm* with *téleios* (1 K. 8:61; 11:4; 15:3,14; 1 Ch. 28:9),[55] *plḗrēs* (Ruth 2:12; 2 K. 20:3; 1 Ch. 29:9; 2 Ch. 15:17; 16:9; 19:9; 25:2),[56] *eirēnikós* (Gen. 34:21; 1 Ch. 12:39), *alēthinós* (Dt. 25:15; Isa. 38:3), *holóklēros* (Dt. 27:6), *akrótomos* (1 K. 6:7), *díkaios* (Prov. 11:1), *agathós* (1 Ch. 29:19), and finally by a verb (Gen. 15:16; 2 Ch. 8:16).

3. *Lexical Field.* The lexical field of *šālôm* includes: *šillum/šillûm,* "recompense" (Hos. 9:7; Isa. 34:8; Mic. 7:3); *šālēm,* "be intact, be completed, keep peace," piel "restore, recompense, reward, pay," hiphil "complete, deliver, make peace"; the sacrificial term → שֶׁלֶם *šelem,* pl. *šᵉlāmîm; šālēm,* "intact, complete, peaceful; *šālum,* "peaceable" (2 S. 20:19[18]); *šillēm,* "recompense" (Dt. 32:35); *šillumâ,* "recompense" (Ps. 91:8); *šalmōnîm,* "gifts" (Isa. 1:23); *ṭôḇ,* "good"; *nûaḥ,* "rest."[57]

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *Mesopotamia.* In Mesopotamia equivalents to *šālôm* appear in a variety of contexts. For the mythological accounts of prehistory, it is fundamentally true that already in the Sumerian view "the fundamental, primordial state of the world was one of uni-

51. *TRE,* XI, 605.
52. Foerster, 406.
53. Gerleman, *TLOT,* III, 1348.
54. Foerster, 408; A. Schmitt, *ZAW* 86 (1974) 140.
55. G. Delling, *TDNT,* VIII, 72.
56. Idem, *TDNT,* VI, 284.
57. → IX, 278; see M. Metzger, *UF* 2 (1970) 157-58.

versal peace, including at least the entire human and animal world"[58] — a divine order transcending all human possibilities.[59] Texts referring to the kingship maintain that during the reign of a sovereign what was promised to him on the occasion of his enthronement is realized effectually. When the king strives to achieve peace and order, what is at stake is the peace and order of the entire world.[60] The temple hymns, too, speak of divine peace in which the world is to share; the ritual expresses and thus "effects" an intact world.[61]

This Sumerian usage lived on in Akkadian texts.[62] In the Neo-Babylonian period, when the kings had largely lost their divine quality, statements concerning peace are increasingly rare in indicative promises or hymns, becoming more frequent in prayers, for example, in the prayers concluding building inscriptions.[63]

We may cite certain stock expressions such as *salīma šakānu,* "make peace, grant reconciliation" (Old Bab. *salīma epēšum*) and *bēl salīma,* "(political) friend."[64] Noth[65] has pointed out a Mari text that reads: *[s]a-li-ma-am bi-ri-t ḫa-na*^mes^ *û i-da-ma-ra-az aš-ku-[u]n,* "an agreement between the Hana people and Idamaraz I brought about."[66] In a letter to Zimrilim,[67] we find the command: *ḫa-a-ra-am ša sa-li-mi-im qú-tu-ul-ma,* "kill an ass of the agreement." The expression *salīmam birit . . . û* may be compared to Heb. *šālôm bên . . . ûḇên* (Jgs. 4:17; 1 S. 7:14; 1 K. 5:26[12]), *salīmam . . . aškun* to Heb. *'āśâ šālôm* (Josh. 9:15; Isa. 27:5). The letter to Zimri-Lim may be compared to Heb. *kāraṯ beriṯ šālôm* (Ezk. 34:25; 37:26).[68] The phrase *ṭūbtu u sulummū* is a technical term for peace procured by treaty.[69] According to Wiseman,[70] the meaning of *šālôm* as the "settlement" of a dispute was incorporated into a late type of legal document called *egirtu ša šulmu,* "document of reconciliation."

The commonest salutation formula was *lū šulmu,* e.g., Middle Bab. *ana kāša lū šulmu, lū šulmu ana bēlīya,* "Hail [lit. 'well-being'] to you, hail to my lord." In later Old Babylonian letters we often find: *lū šalmāta,* "May you be well." In later times the sender would write: *šulmu yāši (ana bīt bēlīya),* "It is well with me (with the house of my lord)." Referring to the addressee, the writer may say: *šulumka maḫar šamaš ū marduk lū dari,* "May your well-being endure in the presence of Shamash and Marduk."

---

58. Schmid, *šalôm,* 30.
59. Gross, *Idee,* 17-27; *ANET,* 37-41.
60. Schmid, *šalôm,* 36; *SAHG,* 87-90, 101-2, 102-5, 105-9, 109-19, 120-23, 123-26, 126-30; *ANET,* 159-61.
61. Schmid, *šalôm,* 37-39; *SAHG,* 132, 134-35.
62. *AOT,* 380-83; *ANET,* 163-65; *KB,* III/1, 130-31; III/2, 38-39, 43-59.
63. Schmid, *šalôm,* 42-43; *SAHG,* 282-85, 285-86, 286-87, 287-88, 288-90, 291-92.
64. *AHw,* II, 1015-16.
65. Noth, 108-9.
66. II.37, ll. 13-14; *ARM,* II, 82-83.
67. G. Dossin, *Syr* 19 (1938) 109.
68. Noth, 113.
69. Johag, 5; I. Höver-Johag, → V, 301.
70. Pp. 325-26; Wiseman cites an Assyrian-Aramaic example published by S. A. Kaufman, "An Assyro-Aramaic *egirtu ša šulmu,*" in M. de Jong Ellis, ed., *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of J. J. Finkelstein* (Hamden, 1977), 119-27.

In late letters the salutation might run: *bēl ū nabû šulmu ṭūb libbi ṭūb šīrē ū arāku ūmē ša bēlīya liqbû,* "May Bel and Nabu ordain well-being, excellence of heart, excellence of body, and length of days for my lord."[71] The significant point of this formula is the association of life, excellence, and length of days with *šulmu* — probably explicatively.

In Akkadian we also find divine names based on the root *šlm,* e.g., *Šulmān/Š(S)alamānu.*[72] These are comparable to some names of Assyrian kings: *šalim-aḫum,* "Shalim is a brother," *šulmānu-ašarēdu* (Shalmaneser), "Shulman is first."[73] There is also the goddess Shulmanitu, who was Lady of URU-SILIM-MA, a place identified by Albright with the netherworld. But he also mentions the possibility that this cuneiform name was applied to Jerusalem by scribes of the 2d millennium.[74] In any event we may observe a close relationship between Shulman, Shulmanitu, and gods of the netherworld in lists of Assyrian deities.[75]

In the Annals of Ashurnasirpal II[76] we find the name *šulmanuka-šar-ilāni,* "Shulmanuka is king of the gods."[77] This name represents the Hurrian adaptation of the god.[78]

The Mari texts contain numerous personal names containing the element *s/šalim,* which probably represents the West Semitic DN *šalim.*[79] A tablet in Aramaic from Ashur contains the PN *silim-aššur,* "Be peaceful, Ashur."[80] We also find a woman named Salimatum, "reconciliation," whose name signifies that to the parents a child preserved from death (after a sickness or death in the family) was a sign that the gods were appeased.[81] The name *abum-šalim,* "the father is uninjured," may be understood as an example of a substitute name.[82] The verb *šalāmu* or *šullumu* can be an element of names embodying a wish or prayer: *li-iš-lim-ki-nu-um,* "may the true one be uninjured," *ᵈenlil-šallim-apla,* "Enlil, keep the heir uninjured."[83]

Finally, we note the inscription on the statue of King Idrimi of Alalakh, in which l. 54 contains the word *šulmīya,* "my salutation, my gift of recognition."[84]

2. *Egypt and Ḫatti.* The situation in Egypt is similar to that in Mesopotamia. Here too we find a notion corresponding to Sem. *šlm,* above all in three contexts. The en-

71. Salonen, "Gruss."
72. *HAL,* II, 1540.
73. Stolz, 199; Pope, 307.
74. See III.6 below.
75. Albright, 164-67.
76. L. 78.
77. See also C. Virolleaud, *Syr* 10 (1929), pl. lxxvi, no. 2, ll. 6,16.
78. W. Spiegelberg, *ZA* 13 (1898) 120.
79. *APNM,* 247; Stamm, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," 67 n. 40; for the Kültepe texts see Nyberg, 352.
80. *KAI* 236.1; for additional names containing the element *salam,* see *APN,* 190-91.
81. See also *AN,* 248.
82. Stamm, "Name," 294-96; *AN,* 294.
83. *AN,* 152-53, 176.
84. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 13 (1981) 219.

thronement ritual and hymns praising the king speak repeatedly of the enthronement as "the dawn of an age of peace and well-being encompassing everything, both heaven and earth."[85] This is nothing other than the divine order of the universe, Maat. "It is in the context of Maat . . . that talk about 'peace' has its locus";[86] here "peace" includes the subjugation of foreign nations.[87] In descriptions of the primordial age, the world is described "as it is actually intended, as it actually is and actually should be."[88] In individual "historical" texts it is also clear that peace implies the subjugation of the enemy. The order of the world is the order of the Egyptian world; the enemy is on the side of chaos.[89] In summary, we may say that in Egypt one can speak of "peace" only with respect to a comprehensive sense of order, which in addition to respite from enemies includes the domain of justice and injustice, and even extends to the order of the cosmos.[90]

As to the more limited conceptuality, Helck states: "For the Egyptian, political peace was largely a domestic state; the two verbal expressions employed are *ḥtp* and *hrw*. . . . In foreign relations we do find the saying that 'peace *(hrt)* is more profitable than battle'; but this statement is place in the mouth of the Hittite king and implies submission. . . . The problem of a state of international peace appears to have played a minor role in comparison to the longing for domestic peace. The 'endless years of peace' given to kings by the gods refer to domestic tranquility."[91] This view of peace accords with the words that begin the final section of Merneptah's victory hymn: "The princes are prostrate and say *šlm*."[92] The Canaanite word in Egyptian transcription is undoubtedly an expression of submission. In an inscription in the mortuary temple of Ramses III, similarly, the subjugated people say to the Pharaoh, "We seek peace" or "We surrender."[93]

When we turn to salutations, we find a stereotyped formula from the time of the Pyramid Texts down to the Greco-Roman period: *ind-ḥr.k*, "Hail to you." Its literal meaning is uncertain — possibly "may your countenance be preserved" or "I greet your countenance." This salutation was used to address gods and kings, and sometimes indeterminate objects of sacral nature or a sacred festival. In the Pyramid Texts we find the imperative expression *ỉyy m ḥtp* and *my m ḥtp*, "come in peace."[94] The former was replaced in the Middle Kingdom by *ỉy-wy m ḥtp*, which in the New Kingdom gave way to *ỉy.ty m ḥtp* — simply syntactic variants with the same meaning. Also common was the formula *m ḥtp*, "in peace," as well as *śnb ʿnḫ*, "health and life." The salutation in a

85. Schmid, *šalôm*, 15.
86. Ibid., 15-16.
87. J. Assmann, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete* (1975), 268-73, 473-80, 496-99; *AOT*, 12-15, 25; *ANET*, 365-67.
88. Schmid, *šalôm*, 17; S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. tr. 1973), 114; Assmann, 293-99.
89. Schmid, *šalôm*, 20; see also *AOT*, 20-25; *TGI*[3], 39-40; *ANET*, 199-203, 255-58, 376-78.
90. Schmid, *šalôm*, 26-27.
91. P. 331.
92. *AOT*, 24.
93. Smith, 145-46.
94. *WbÄS*, I, 37.

letter could be very brief, e.g., *m ʿnḫ wḏ3 śnb,* "in life, prosperity, and health." In the New Kingdom, letters concluded with the formula *nfr śnb.k,* "may your health be good."[95]

For the Hittite region we cite only a daily prayer of the king to the god Telipinush, in which he calls blessings down upon his house and his land: "May the god grant long life, health, strength, joy, offspring, rain and favorable winds, fertility of fields and cattle, and victory over enemies, and from the land of Ḫatti avert severe fever, plague, hunger, and misery."[96]

3. *Syria.* In the region of Syria we turn first to the occurrences of the root *šlm* in the Ugaritic texts. They appear primarily in salutation formulas. Quite frequent is the expression *tǵrk tšlmk,* "May they [the gods] protect you and keep you uninjured."[97] In addition to the complex formula *yšlm lk ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk,* "May well-being be yours, may the gods protect you and keep you uninjured,"[98] we also find the short formula *yšlm lk.*[99] These formulas also appear in the Akkadian letters from Ugarit,[100] where the long formula reads: *lū šulmu ana muḫḫika ilānu*^mes^ *ana šulmāni liṣṣurūka,* "May well-being be yours, may the gods protect you for your well-being." The impersonal use of the verb at the beginning of the Ugaritic formula — where Akkadian has the noun — has no parallel in Hebrew.[101]

There is a mythological text[102] in which Baal commands Anat to pour *šlm* into the inner parts of the earth; here *šlm* means "well-being."[103]

Another text describes the deities Shachar and Shalim as "gracious and kindly."[104] Shalim is the god of sunset and the evening star, and therefore probably a hypostasis of Athtart as Venus. This identification establishes a relationship with the netherworld, for *šlm* also means "completion" in the sense of death (cf. Akk. *šalām šamši,* "sunset," and *šalāmtu,* "corpse"). Thus Shalim is a numen of the netherworld and as such is related to the fertility of the land.[105] The name of the city of Jerusalem[106] attests to the worship of this god in the Canaanite region as early as the 19th century B.C.E.[107] Shalim

95. Caminos, 915-16; Grapow, 105, 114-15, 118-19.

96. *ANET,* 397; Gross, "Idee," 45.

97. *KTU* 2.11, 8-9; 2.1, 1-2; 2.13, 7-8; 2.14, 4-5; 5.9, I, 2-3; Hartmann, 102; A. F. Rainey, *UF* 3 (1971) 157-58.

98. 2.13, 7-8.

99. 2.4, 4; 2.6, 4; 2.10, 4.

100. Loewenstamm, 362; in *PRU,* III, 6, 12; IV, 180, 196, 219; RŠ 15.77, 4-6; 11.730, 4-6; 17.286, 4-5; 17.78, 4-5; 17.424, C, 6-7.

101. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies,* 433.

102. *KTU* 1.3, III, 13.

103. See J. Gray, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (^{2}1965), 46 n. 1; cf. Gross, "Idee," who understands *šlm* as meaning "peace."

104. *KTU* 1.23.

105. Stolz, 202, 209, 216, 218-19; N. Wyatt, *UF* 9 (1977) 381; idem, *UF* 18 (1985) 386; idem, *UF* 19 (1987) 382; M. H. Pope, *FS C. F. A. Schaeffer. UF* 11 (1979) 703-8.

106. See III.6 below.

107. Egyptian Execration texts of the 12th Dynasty; Pope, 306; Gray, *Legacy,* 14 n. 2.

appears also in a list of gods[108] and in personal names[109] down to the 5th or 4th century B.C.E.[110] The DN *šal-ma-ya-a-ti*[111] is probably also derived from Shalim, as well as the name of the Phoenician god Eshmun.[112]

As already suggested, there are also personal names incorporating the element *šlm*, e.g., *ṣdqšlm, šlmym, ilšlm,* and *b'lšlm.*[113]

The affinity of Hebrew literature to Ugaritic literature is revealed in several stylistic similarities. For example, the Ugaritic parallelism *šlm//'zz* echoes the parallelism *'ōz// šālôm* in Ps. 29:11 (cf. also Ps. 62:12-13[11-12]).[114] A repetition of *šālôm* as in Ugaritic appears in Gen. 37:14; 2 S. 11:7; Isa. 27:5; 57:19; 65:6; Prov. 7:14; Eccl. 5:3.[115] The Ugaritic parallelism *šlm//nḥ* appears also in Isa. 57:2,[116] and Ugar. *kll* + *šlm* appears in Jer. 13:19.[117] Above all, the Ugaritic pair *mlḥmt — šlm* appears in Ps. 120:7; 2 S. 8:10; 11:7; 1 K. 2:5; 20:18; 1 Ch. 18:10; Isa. 27:4-5; Mic. 3:5; Zec. 9:10; Eccl. 3:8.[118] In this last group of passages — with the exception of 2 S. 11:7 — *milḥāmâ* finds in *šālôm* its most complete semantic antithesis.[119]

From Ugarit, finally, we have a text wishing peace to the royal family and the city, beginning with repeated *šlm:* "Peace upon peace to *'mr[pi]* and peace to his house! Peace to *ṯryl,* peace to her house! Peace to Ugarit, peace to its gates!"[120] There are many other occurrences of the root *šlm.*[121]

In the Amarna letters we find the salutation formula: "May it be well with you *(ana kaša lū šulmu),* your house, my sister and your other wives, your children, your chariots, your horses, your army, your land, and all your possessions, may you have well-being in abundant, abundant measure!"[122] This formula is preceded by *ana iāši šulum,* "It is well with me"; this usage is exceptional, since Ugaritic letters and the Akkadian letters from Ugarit place a similar formula after the salutation.[123]

Loewenstamm[124] cites the salutation *ilānu šulumka šulum bītika liš'al,* "May the de-

108. *KTU* 1.47, 12; on the Akkadian version of the list see E. Weidner, *AfO* 18 (1957/58) 170.

109. See below.

110. N. Glueck, *BASOR* 82 (1941) 7-9; Gray, "Desert God," 74; Z. S. Harris, *Grammar of the Phoenician Language. AOS* 8 (1936), 150.

111. EA 155:8,15,22,26,29,42,50,62; see Fohrer, *TDNT,* VII, 298.

112. Albright, 168-69.

113. *PNU,* 193; *APNM,* 246-47.

114. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 352.

115. Ibid., 353.

116. Idem, *RSP,* II, 32.

117. Idem, *RSP,* I, 228.

118. Ibid., 262.

119. H. D. Preuss, → VIII, 342.

120. *KTU* 1.161, 31-34; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 15 (1983) 22; W. T. Pitard, *BASOR* 232 (1978) 72.

121. For example, *KTU* 2.5, 3; 2.11, 12, 16; 2.12, 13; 2.13, 10, 12.

122. EA 19:5-8.

123. Kristensen, 152.

124. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies,* 437-38.

ity see to your welfare (and) the welfare of your house,"[125] and a similar formula in a letter from Taanach: *ilānu liš'alū šulumka šulum bītika mārīka,* "May the gods see to your welfare, the welfare of your house and of your sons," as well as analogous formulas in the letters from Arad[126] and Elephantine,[127] and in Late Babylonian and Assyrian letters. He hypothesizes that this style of salutation developed in ancient Canaan and made its way into late Akkadian via Aramaic.

In a bilingual inscription (Phoenician and Hieroglyphic Hittite) from Karatepe, Azitawada says: "I sat upon the throne of my father and established *šlm* with every king."[128] The same inscription includes the wish: "And may Baal-*krntryš* bless *'ztwd* with life and *šlm*."[129] In the Sefire inscriptions,[130] we find the following words: "Now as to all the kings in my vicinity or anyone who is my friend, when I send my messenger to him *lšlm* . . . , then the road shall be open for me."[131]

In an Old Aramaic political letter from Assyria, *š^elām* appears in the introductory formula in l. 1 and a PN Nabu-Shallim is found in l. 14.[132] An Aramaic inscription from Hatra mentions a certain *šlmn,* son of *gmn'*.[133]

Finally, we may cite word pairs that occur in both Phoenician and Hebrew: *šlm* — *'z*[134] as in Ps. 29:11, *ḥym* — *šlm*[135] as in Mal. 2:5; Prov. 3:2; 1QH 7:15.[136]

In the Lachish ostraca, too, *šlm* appears in a salutation: "May Yahweh let my lord hear news of *šlm*."[137] In an ostracon from Elephantine that concerns a dream and its interpretation, an apparition greets the dreamer with *šlm*.[138]

III. OT.

1. *Tetrateuch.* In the Tetrateuch *šālôm* appears primarily with prepositions. The expression *b^ešālôm* should be translated not "in peace" but "in good condition, safe and sound." For example, Abraham goes to his ancestors *b^ešālôm,* i.e., at a great age, his life fulfilled (Gen. 15:15; cf. 26:29,31; 28:21; Ex. 18:23).

---

125. EA 96:4-6.

126. D. Pardee, *UF* 10 (1978) 315.

127. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1954), 10-14, 17, 35-36; *AP* 17.1; 21.2; 30.1; 34.7; 37.1; 38.2; 39.1-3; 40.1; 41.1-2; 42.1; 54.10; 57.1,8. For other occurrences of *šlm* see 35.2; 37.2; 41.8; 56.1; 57.4; 58.1-2; 65.4, 1-2; 66.9, 1; 67.11, 2; 68.1, 2; 8, 2; 69, C, 1; 70.1; 77.1; Ahiqar 110, 120.

128. *KAI* 26A.I, 11-12.

129. *KAI* 26A.III, 2-3; cf. 26C.III, 16-18; see also 46.3-5; 50.2-3; 142.7; 233.1.

130. III, 8.

131. J. A. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. BietOr* 19 (1967), 96-97; on Sefire I.B.24, see ibid., 16-17; *DISO,* 303-5.

132. M. Lidzbarski, *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 38 (²1970), 8; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Syr* 24 (1944/45) 32-33.

133. A. Caquot, *Syr* 41 (1964) 257, no. 130. See also *HAL,* II, 1540; Pope, 307; Gray, "Desert God," 78; Benz, 417-18; *KAI* 40.3-4; 43.3; 49.13, 46; 193.20; Nyberg, 352-53.

134. *KAI* 26A.III.3-4; 26C.III.18; cf. *KTU* 5.9, 3-4.

135. *KAI* 26A.III.3; 26C.III.17-18.

136. Y. Avishur, *UF* 7 (1975) 25, 30.

137. *KAI* 192.1-3; 193.2-3; 197.1-2; cf. 195.1-2; 196.1-2.

138. *KAI* 270A.7.

The expression *lᵉšālôm* belongs in the context of salutations and greetings. Joseph's brothers could no longer speak to him[139] "toward *šālôm*,"[140] i.e., they could no longer address a friendly greeting to him (Gen. 37:4). "Thus is expression given to the rupture of fellowship between the brothers and Joseph," for "It is the greeting of welcome and farewell, the inquiry after one's health, that maintains intact the שלוֹם of the community."[141] Therefore when Gerleman interprets *dibber lᵉšālôm* as "to speak to someone's liking," he fails to do justice to the depth of meaning of *šālôm* in the situation of Gen. 37:4.[142]

Joseph inquires *(š'l)* after his brothers' *šālôm* (Gen. 43:27), a question that should be understood simply as a salutation formula, "the familiar manner of greeting."[143] Then the greeting expands to include an inquiry into the *šālôm* of their father, to which the brothers reply: "Your servant has *šālôm* . . . , he is still alive" (vv. 27-28). The parallelism shows that *šālôm* refers to the state of being alive, of well-being. Gerleman translates the expression *š'l lᵉšālôm* as "inquire about someone's (external and internal) state of satisfaction";[144] here too his translation fails to do justice to the meaning of *šālôm* (cf. 29:6; Ex. 18:7). Wiseman, too, when he speaks of a technical or diplomatic usage of the phrase *š'l lᵉšālôm* in this context, hardly does justice to the situation portrayed.[145]

The *šālôm* greeting can be expanded by addition of the formula "do not be afraid" (Gen. 43:23): the brothers need not fear for their well-being. As in the cultic assurance of well-being, the formula is grounded in what God has already done (perfective verb).[146]

The leave-taking formula is "Go *lᵉšālôm* — safe and sound" (Ex. 4:18; cf. Gen. 44:17). It is noteworthy that the leave-taking formula "is used exclusively by a person of higher status speaking to someone of lower status."[147]

Gerleman interprets *šālôm* in combination with the preps. *bᵉ* and *lᵉ* as inner satisfaction and maintains that the two expressions are synonymous.[148] Neither claim is accurate. Jenni comes to the following — somewhat overstated — conclusion: "*lēḵ lᵉšālôm* means a departure in expectation of well-being, peace, and happiness, without going into the actual circumstances at the moment the words are spoken; *lēḵ bᵉšālôm,* by contrast, says that the departure takes place explicitly under presently obtaining peaceful, safe, and secure circumstances, the contrary circumstances being implicitly ruled out."[149]

The meaning of *šālôm* as "well-being" is clear in Gen. 37:14, where Israel tells Jo-

---

139. See *BHS.*
140. *HAL,* I, 508.
141. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 37.
142. *TLOT,* III, 1343-44.
143. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 125.
144. *TLOT,* III, 1344.
145. P. 322.
146. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 124.
147. Lande, 8.
148. *TLOT,* III, 1343.
149. P. 43.

seph to check up on the *šālôm* of his brothers and the *šālôm* of the flock. "The animals are also included in the prosperity (שׁלום) of the community; it is on their well-being that that of the people depends."[150]

In the passages discussed *šālôm* has no specifically religious or theological connotations — even in Gen. 28:21, where it appears in the context of an oath formula. This situation changes as soon as God is named explicitly as the giver of *šālôm*, as in Gen. 41:16. In Nu. 25:12 (P) Yahweh grants Phinehas a *b*ᵉ*rîṯ šālôm*.[151] Since this text speaks of a one-sided pledge made by Yahweh, *b*ᵉ*rîṯ* should not be translated as "covenant"; it should be understood as a personal commitment on the part of Yahweh.[152] Syntactically, *šālôm* should be treated "either as an appositive or as an accusative."[153] I prefer to interpret it as an appositive: "my *b*ᵉ*rîṯ*, namely *šālôm*." We are dealing with an assurance of well-being, which implies "divine protection, security, prosperity," or "goodwill, favor" in the political sense.[154] Gerleman claims that in every occurrence of *b*ᵉ*rîṯ šālôm* the phrase reflects a specific covenant concept, "not based primarily on future obligations but which should be understood as the adjustment of a past process."[155] He believes that it means "covenant of requital, obligation to make restitution" — an interpretation that fails to convince. The same is true of Durham's proposal to understand *b*ᵉ*rîṯ šālôm* as "covenant of completion or fulfillment."[156]

In Lev. 26:6 *šālôm* appears in the context of a promised blessing: "I will grant *šālôm* in the land." When the context is taken into account, it is noteworthy that *šālôm* appears in a setting that describes an all-embracing state of well-being, which includes the fertility of the land and the absence of dangerous animals. Furthermore, *šālôm* means peace in contrast to war, although the text does not necessarily presuppose that this peace implies subjugation of the enemy.[157]

The priestly blessing in Nu. 6:24-26 concludes with the wish: "May Yahweh lift up his countenance upon you and ordain *(śîm) šālôm* for you." Here *šālôm* denotes the substance and result of Yahweh's favor, hence well-being in a comprehensive sense.[158] On the basis of this passage, Durham argues that *šālôm* is a cultic term with special reference to the "presence" theology of the OT.[159] This theory seems to me to lack supporting evidence. To this point the most concentrated theological employment of *šālôm* thus belongs to a P context, although this setting does not rule out the possibility that individual elements of the formula may be earlier.[160]

---

150. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50*, 39.
151. On the text see *BHS*.
152. E. Kutsch, *TLOT*, I, 262.
153. Eisenbeis, 94.
154. Eisenbeis, 95-96.
155. *TLOT*, III, 1344.
156. P. 279.
157. Schmid, *šalôm*, 57-58.
158. Horst, 194-95.
159. Pp. 284, 289.
160. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1968), 57-58.

2. *Deuteronomy, Dtr Literature, and Chr Literature.* In Deuteronomy the meaning of *šālôm* shifts to the political realm. In 2:26 the *diḇrê šālôm* are to be interpreted as "words of an agreement." The use of *šālôm* in the rules of warfare is characteristic: "When you draw near to a town to fight against it, call out to it *l^{e}šālôm.* If it replies *(ʿnh) šālôm* to you and surrenders to you, then all the people in it shall serve you at forced labor" (20:10-11). But if it refuses *šālôm* (*šlm* hiphil), the consequence is siege, extermination of the male population, and enslavement of the women, children, and elderly (vv. 12-14). Here it is clear that *šālôm* does not mean "peace" in the sense of nonviolent resolution of a conflict. The expression *qārāʾ l^{e}šālôm* means proclamation of the right order for Israel, Israel's well-being, *pax israelitica,* to be established by military force if necessary.[161]

Dt. 23:7(6) forbids Israel to promote the *šālôm* and *ṭôḇâ* of the Ammonites and Moabites. Akk. *ṭūbtu u sulummû,* which is "a term for peace resulting from a treaty,"[162] suggests that the expression probably refers to a treaty of friendship.[163] Dt. 29:18(19) uses *šālôm* in the context of a "counter-blessing" to ward off a threatened curse; it means well-being and security in contrast to disaster: *šālôm* is postulated where there is no *šālôm.*

In DtrH we find the prepositional constructions discussed above. In Josh. 10:21 the military contingent returns *b^{e}šālôm,* "safe and sound"; cf. Jgs. 8:9; 11:31; 1 S. 29:7; 2 S. 3:21-23; 15:9,27; 19:25,31; 1 K. 2:6; 22:17,27,28 (= 2 Ch. 18:16,26,27); 2 K. 22:20 (= 2 Ch. 34:28); 2 Ch. 19:1. Eisenbeis finds in 2 K. 22:20 = 2 Ch. 34:28 ("I will gather [*ʾsp* hiphil] you to your ancestors, and you shall be gathered [*ʾsp* niphal] to your grave in peace [*b^{e}šālôm*]") a statement that is essentially theological: "From the perspective of the phenomenology of religion, 'gather' means that the individual . . . enters into the origin and ground from which he emerged."[164] Natural death is thus a kind of initiation rite.[165] It is questionable, however, whether this view can be sustained in light of the total desacralization of death in the OT.

Even though 1 S. 29:7; 2 S. 15:9,27; 1 K. 22:17; and 2 Ch. 18:16 stand in the context of a dismissal, the accent — in contrast to the construction with *l^e* — is probably on "sending away safe and sound," since there is a conflict involved in each instance.[166]

The prepositional construction *l^{e}šālôm* also occurs in the context of greetings. The expression *šʾl l^{e}šālôm* appears in Jgs. 18:15; 1 S. 10:4; 17:22; 25:5; 30:21; 2 S. 8:10// 1 Ch. 18:10 Q. The last passage may involve an act of homage as a token of submission.[167] This usage would represent a borrowing from Akkadian, where *šaʾal šulmi* is

---

161. Schmid, *šalôm,* 60.

162. I. Höver-Johag, → V, 301.

163. Contra Wiseman, 313-14.

164. P. 115.

165. M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* (Eng. tr. New York, 1959), 184; *ILC,* I-II, 328, 495-96; III-IV, 478.

166. On the difference between *b^e* and *l^e,* see Eisenbeis, 128-29; Brockelmann, *Synt,* §106c-d.

167. Eisenbeis, 103; Wiseman, 318-19.

an obligation of the Assyrian vassal.[168] The expression *pqd lᵉšālôm,* "inquire after someone's welfare," appears in 1 S. 17:18. For dismissals see Jgs. 18:6; 1 S. 1:17; 20:13,42; 25:25; 2 K. 5:19.

Of greetings, it is fundamentally true that "when a greeting of peace is offered, the stranger is received into the sphere of *šālôm* . . . , which otherwise embraces only the family or the clan."[169] A farewell involves an utterance of power, intended to convey a blessing.[170]

A greeting also stands in the background of 2 K. 10:13: the royal princes of Judah are going to Jezreel "*lišlôm* of the sons of the king and the sons of the queen mother." Here *lišlôm* stands for the fuller *š'l lᵉšālôm.*[171]

Greetings and coming with peaceful intentions are closely related. This relationship is clear in 1 S. 16:4-5, where Samuel is asked, "Does your coming mean *šālôm?*" and he responds, "*šālôm*" (cf. 1 K. 2:13; 2 K. 5:21-22). In the account of Jehu's revolution, *šālôm* plays the role of a catchword, varying in meaning between "well-being" and "peace, peaceful intentions." When the prophet's disciple leaves, the officers ask,[172] "*hᵃšālôm,* Is everything all right?" (2 K. 9:11).[173] When Jehu approaches Jezreel, Joram sends messengers with the question "*hᵃšālôm,* Are your intentions peaceful?" (2 K. 9:17-18,19;[174] cf. vv. 22,31). Jehu answers, "What have you to do with *šālôm?*" i.e., "What do you care whether my intentions are peaceful?" (vv. 18-19). Jehu asks Joram, "*mâ haššālôm,* What do you mean, *šālôm?* What do you mean, 'peaceful intentions'?" (v. 22; cf. 2 S. 20:9).[175]

A greeting is also the context of formulas like that in 1 S. 25:6: *wᵉ'attâ šālôm ûḇêṯᵉḵā šālôm wᵉḵōl 'ᵃšer-lᵉḵā šālôm,* "*šālôm* to you, *šālôm* to your house, *šālôm* to all that is yours."[176] The short form of greeting is simply *šālôm* (2 S. 18:28; 2 K. 4:23)[177] or *šālôm lāḵ* (Jgs. 19:20). Gerleman's translation of the latter expression as "(May there be) enough for you" can hardly be accurate.[178] Lande points out the magical setting of the greeting formula: "The spoken word possesses efficacy."[179]

How little *šālôm* inherently means "peace" (rather than "well-being") is shown by 2 S. 11:7, where David asks about the *šālôm* of Joab, the fighters, and the battle. This

168. Lande, 6.

169. Westermann, *Forschung am AT,* 209.

170. Eisenbeis, 121, although his theory that the idiom *lēḵ lᵉšālôm* is a cultic blessing formula is not supported by the evidence.

171. E. Würthwein, *1.Kön. 17–2.Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 327.

172. See *BHS.*

173. Eisenbeis, 104, calls the use of *šālôm* here "slang"; according to Y. Minokami, *Die Revolution des Jehu. GTA* 38 (1989), 125 n. 3, *šālôm* has the meaning "everything's all right" throughout 2 K. 9–10.

174. See *BHS.*

175. See also Wiseman, 319-21.

176. Brockelmann, *Synt,* §7b.

177. Here again Eisenbeis (p. 104) speaks of "slang" that means "Leave me alone," "What does it matter to you?" "Don't delay me"; cf. Lande, 9.

178. *TLOT,* III, 1344.

179. P. 3.

passage makes clear that in the early period of the monarchy war was considered a normal and necessary phenomenon within the reality of the contemporary world.[180] The meaning of *šālôm* as "well-being, wholeness" is likewise clear in 1 S. 20:7,21; 2 S. 17:3; 18:29,32; 2 K. 4:26.

Only in a few passages does *šālôm* have the political meaning of peace in contrast to war. The action of the tribal league against Benjamin ends with an offer of *šālôm* to the Benjaminites (Jgs. 21:13). Jgs. 4:17 notes that there was *šālôm* between Jabin, the king of Hazor, and the clan of Heber the Kenite. The construction *šālôm bên . . . ûḇên* indicates that the relationship between two parties is sound, implying peace (1 S. 7:14). In this context the term *b^erîṯ* also is closely related to *šālôm,* as in 1 K. 5:26(12): "There was *šālôm* between Hiram and Solomon, and the two of them made a *b^erîṯ,* a treaty." Here the essence of the *b^erîṯ* is denoted by *šālôm;*[181] *šālôm* belongs to the terminology of treaties.[182] When 1 K. 5:4(4:24) says that Solomon had *šālôm* on all sides as a consequence of his dominion over Syria and Palestine,[183] the text is referring to the "pacification" of this region under the *pax israelitica.* With respect to 1 K. 5:4b-5(4:24b-25), Braulik says: "Now Israel can not only dwell secure, as in the time of the judges . . . , but also enjoy this life in prosperity," showing that even in the political context *šālôm* means more than the mere absence of war.[184] The sense of *šālôm* as "peace" in contrast to war is also present in 1 K. 2:5;[185] 20:18; 2 K. 20:19b (cf. Isa. 39:8); 1 Ch. 12:18.

Jgs. 11:13 merits special consideration. There the king of the Ammonites says to the messengers of Jephthah: "Israel took away my land . . . ; now restore it[186] *b^ešālôm.*" As in Dt. 20:10-11, where *šālôm* refers to the *pax israelitica,* it refers here to the *pax ammonitica.* Jephthah is expected to respect this *šālôm* and restore the land voluntarily, without the need for military action.[187] To people who share this ideology, a demand to renounce war and espouse peace is inconceivable. Indeed, the establishment or preservation of *šālôm* may necessitate the employment of military forces. To this way of thinking, war is fundamentally legitimate.[188]

The context of Josh. 9:15 is also political: "Then Joshua made *(ʿśh) šālôm* for them and concluded a *b^erîṯ* for them, guaranteeing their lives." The repeated *lāhem,* in contrast to the construction using *bên . . . ûḇên,* shows that the passage is thinking not of a peace treaty between two equal parties but rather the imposition of the *pax israelitica.* Begrich has noted that *b^erîṯ* inherently denotes a relationship between two unequal parties determined by one of them; the more powerful undertakes certain obligations toward the less powerful, while no terms are imposed on the recipient — apart from the

180. Westermann, *Forschung am AT,* 215.

181. J. Begrich, *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 60; Y. Avishur, *Stylistic Studies of Word Pairs in Biblical and Semitic Literatures. AOAT* 210 (1984), 178.

182. T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah. CBOT* 8 (1976), 226-27.

183. M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 76.

184. P. 34.

185. Noth, *Könige I,* 30.

186. *BHS.*

187. Eisenbeis, 107.

188. Schmid, *šalôm,* 58-62.

debt of loyalty.[189] With respect to Josh. 9:15 and 1 K. 5:26, Weinfeld has observed that *šālôm* functions as a synonym of *b^e^rîṯ;* he points out that the terms for "covenant" are often combined in pairs, a usage characteristic of covenant terminology of all periods and all cultures.[190]

Ezr. 9:12, "never seek their *šālôm* and their good *(ṭôḇâ),*" seems to prohibit a treaty relationship, after the analogy of the Akkadian phrase *ṭūbtu u sulummu.*[191] In other words, the text forbids not only mixed marriages but also political alliances with foreign nations. The suggestion that the expression should be understood eschatologically (with anti-Samaritan overtones) is incongruous.[192]

The term *šālôm* embodies truly theological content only when it is associated explicitly with Yahweh. For example, Jgs. 6:24 describes Gideon's building of an altar, which he calls "Yahweh *šālôm.*" In v. 23 Yahweh had said to Gideon: "*šālôm* be to you; do not fear, you shall not die." In this formula the mostly likely meaning of *šālôm* is "safety, wholeness." If so, the name "Yahweh *šālôm*" means "Yahweh is safety." The extended context suggests that it refers primarily to deliverance from enemies. Behind Jgs. 6:24 may stand an identification of Yahweh with a Baal Shalem.[193]

In 1 K. 2:33 Solomon expresses the wish that "to David and to his descendants and to his house and to his throne there be *šālôm* forevermore from Yahweh." Given the bloodguilt that Joab and his descendants have incurred, *šālôm* here probably means "wellness" in the sense of "wholeness." "In 31b and 33 the idea is expressed that the blood wrongfully spilled by Joab . . . imposes bloodguilt on the house of David . . . and that, with the ruthless elimination of Joab, this burden was shifted to the man who was the real guilty party, so that the Davidic kingship is finally exonerated and restored to a state of 'wholeness' (שׁלום)"[194] — but all on the initiative of Yahweh. In 1 Ch. 12:19(18) Amasai cries out to David: "*šālôm, šālôm* to you and to the one who helps you, for your God is the one who helps you." Here, of course, *šālôm* means primarily success in battle; but this success is ascribed explicitly to God — a notion characteristic of the Chronicler.[195] In 2 Ch. 15:5-6, conversely, the fact that "there was no *šālôm* for anyone going or coming" — *šālôm* in this context meaning political and military security — is also blamed on God (cf. Zec. 8:10). The close relationship of *šālôm* to *nûaḥ* and *šeqeṭ* is illustrated by 1 Ch. 22:9. Again it is Yahweh who establishes the state of military calm and political peace.[196]

3. *Prophetic Literature.* In the corpus of prophetic literature *šālôm* makes its first appearance in Isaiah. One of the throne names of the royal child in Isa. 9:5(6) is *śar-*

---

189. Begrich, *GSAT,* 56.

190. → II, 259.

191. → V, 301.

192. Cf. Eisenbeis, 144-45.

193. Schmid, *šalôm,* 86 n. 135; O. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* II (1963), 146; L. Schmidt, *Menschlicher Erfolg und Jahwes Initiative. WMANT* 38 (1970), 33.

194. Noth, *Könige I,* 36.

195. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbucher. HAT* I/21 (1955), xix.

196. On *šālôm* in Chronicles, see now Gabriel, reviewed by J. Becker, *BZ* 37 (1993) 93-94.

šālôm, "Prince of *šālôm.*" V. 6(7) says of his rule[197] that there shall be endless *šālôm.* The context speaks of *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ,* on which the future king will establish his rule. Here *šālôm* means the total divine order of the world, which it is the king's duty to protect by promoting righteousness and justice; implicit are prosperity and blessing, happiness and well-being.[198] Also implied is "freedom from foreign military powers."[199] "*šālôm* is the result of right *mišpāṭ.*"[200] Gerleman's interpretation[201] of *śar-šālôm* as "Prince of Requital" or "Prince of Tribute" is hard to accept,[202] as is Alt's interpretation[203] of it as "Welfare Officer."

Although I agree with Wildberger that Isa. 8:23b–9:6(7) is Isaianic, elsewhere in the book of Isaiah *šālôm* appears only in postexilic additions.[204] Isa. 26:3 says of the righteous nation, "Their mind is steadfast, you maintain *šālôm, šālôm,* for they trust in you."[205] "Israel has experienced and can confess that Yahweh preserves שׁלום (peace) for one who has a 'solid frame of mind'"[206] — this steadfast mind being defined as trust in Yahweh, the source of *šālôm.* Here *šālôm* clearly means general well-being, as well as salvation in the theological sense.

Isa. 26:11 suggests that *šālôm* refers primarily to a state of political and military peace; but in 26:12[207] all the overtones of "well-being" and "wholeness" may also be heard.[208] In 27:2-5 Yahweh says that he will destroy Israel's enemies unless they seek his protection and make *(ʿśh) šālôm* with him. This *šālôm* "is not really 'made' by those who seek protection, but is the result of their turning to Yahweh." Here *šālôm* "expresses the all-encompassing salvation at the end of time."[209]

The interpretation of Isa. 33:7 is disputed. Kaiser understands the envoys of *šālôm* who weep bitterly to be negotiators sent in vain to sue for peace;[210] Wildberger reads the text as "messengers from Salem" (= Jerusalem).[211]

In Isaiah 38:17 Hezekiah declares in his prayer of thanksgiving: "Behold, bitterness became *šālôm* for me."[212] "That bitter experiences (מר) can serve to bring restoration (שׁלום) belongs to the experience of faith of the pious in the OT. . . . The present pas-

197. *BHS.*

198. Wildberger, *Jahwe und sein Volk. ThB* 66 (1979), 60-61.

199. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 405; cf. Stamm, *BHHW,* I, 500-501.

200. E. Kellenberger, *Häsäd wäʾamät als Ausdruck einer Glaubensverfahrung. ATANT* 69 (1982), 88 n. 31; cf. G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), 66; idem, *TLOT,* III, 1393-94; K. Koch, *TLOT,* II, 1050-51.

201. *TLOT,* III, 1345.

202. Mettinger, *King and Messiah,* 249.

203. A. Alt, *KlSchr,* II (1953), 219.

204. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 384-410.

205. On the text see Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 542-43.

206. Ibid., 547.

207. On the text see ibid., 554.

208. Ibid., 563.

209. Ibid., 586.

210. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 344-45.

211. *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 276-77.

212. On the text see ibid., 441.

sage shows that the blessing of health is connected with and is not the least important aspect of what שלום (shalom) brings. But yet, this term refers to more than physical well-being alone. The bitterness that is experienced can make life richer, fuller; experiencing restoration to health means more than just going back to the way things were. Instead, it opens new horizons for a life of blessing, brought about by a communal relationship with God."[213]

The occurrences of *šālôm* in Deutero-Isaiah are of great theological relevance. The only exception is 41:3, where Cyrus is described as "passing on safely." Here *šālôm* is used adverbially;[214] it means "be intact, thrive."[215]

In 45:7 Yahweh avows that it is he who "makes *('śh) šālôm* [1QIs[a]: *ṭôḇ*] and creates *(br')* evil *(rā')*." What is at issue is the weal and woe that the nations experience.[216] In a monotheism first encountered in the OT in Deutero-Isaiah, it is the one God who must be responsible for the negative as well as the positive in course of world history.[217]

In 48:18 Israel is promised — provided it keeps Yahweh's commandments — that its *šālôm* will be like a river and its *ṣ*[e]*ḏāqâ* like the waves of the sea. The parallel terms *šālôm* and *ṣ*[e]*ḏāqâ* probably function almost as synonyms. Both denote the salubrious state that results from maintenance of the right order. For the wicked, however, there is no *šālôm* (v. 22; cf. 57:21).

Isa. 52:7 introduces the joyous herald "who announces *šālôm,* proclaims good news *(ṭôḇ),* announces salvation *(y*[e]*šû'â),* who says to Zion, 'Your God reigns.'" Here, as the parallel terms show, *šālôm* refers to an historical event that will benefit Israel: deliverance from exile. But this event is set against the "transcendent background" of the reign of God, the lord of history (cf. Nah. 2:1[1:15]).

Isa. 53:5 is one of the high points of Deutero-Isaiah's theology. The text speaks of the servant of Yahweh: "The punishment *(mûsār)* of our *šālôm* was upon him; by his wounds, healing came to us (*rp'* niphal)." The phrase *mûsār š*[e]*lômēnû* is an objective genitive: "punishment for salvation," "punishment that won our salvation."[218] Here for the first time we encounter explicit reference to the vicarious suffering of the righteous. On the basis of v. 5a, the *šālôm* accomplished by this suffering must include the forgiveness of sins and the annulment of their consequences. Gerleman's interpretation of the text as referring to "the correction we deserved as retribution" is hardly tenable in the light of the par. *rp'* niphal.[219]

In 54:10 Yahweh declares that his steadfast love *(ḥesed)* will not depart from Israel and that the *b*[e]*rîṯ* of his *šālôm* will not be removed. The construct phrase may be rendered as "assurance of my salvation" (cf. Nu. 25:12). The point is the "promise of

---

213. Ibid., 462.

214. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 106; *GK*, §118m, q.

215. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I,* 121.

216. Ibid., 500.

217. See also H. Haag, "'Ich mache Heil und erschafte Unheil' (Jes 45,7)," in J. Schreiner, ed., *Word, Lied und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler,* II. FzB 2 (1972), 179-85.

218. Cf. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1969), 263-64.

219. *TLOT,* III, 1345.

something that is to continue, a new condition of things. . . . *šālôm* is a term denoting a condition and belongs to the vocabulary connected with blessing."[220] It means general well-being and salvation as the gift of God — as also in v. 13. Baltzer[221] points out that *b^erîṯ šālôm* corresponds to the Akkadian phrase *ri-kíl-ta ša-la-ma.*[222]

In Isa. 55:12 the parallelism of *śimḥâ* and *šālôm* shows that joy is an essential element of *šālôm.*[223] Thus *šālôm* means freedom from grief and all that causes grief: Israel's wholeness as the gift of Yahweh.

Fundamentally, the dimensions in which Deutero-Isaiah speaks of the *šālôm* of Yahweh transcend the more obvious political vision of pre-Israelite prophecy of *šālôm.* The focus is on a new exodus, a fundamental new salvific event described in the categories of creation. Here *šālôm* has become an eschatological concept.[224]

In its use of *šālôm,* Trito-Isaiah clearly depends on Deutero-Isaiah. Isa. 57:2 may be compared to 41:3.[225] Of the wicked, 59:8 says: "The way of *šālôm* they do not know. . . . No one who walks in them knows *šālôm.*" Against the background of the notion of retributive justice, the wicked are warned that their way does not lead to salvation, that their life will not succeed but fail, because there is no justice *(mišpāṭ)* in their paths.[226]

In 57:18c and 19 Yahweh promises: "For their mourners I will create the fruit of lips, *šālôm šālôm* to the far and the near." To the Judahites still in exile as well as to those who have already returned, *šālôm* is promised as an enduring state, as wholeness, as salvation (cf. 54:10).[227] To the wicked, however, 57:21 promises *'ên šālôm,* "no salvation."

In 60:17 Yahweh addresses Jerusalem: "I will appoint *šālôm* as your supervision *(p^equddâ)* and *ṣ^eḏāqâ* as your taskmasters [ptcp. of *ngś*]." The overseers and taskmasters of the occupying forces will be replaced by *šālôm* and *ṣ^eḏāqâ.* V. 18 expands on the idea: there will no longer be violence *(ḥāmās)* in the land, no further historical catastrophes will befall them. Instead, right order (*ṣ^eḏāqâ* as "community solidarity"[228]) will prevail, and with it freedom from war and oppression; "the coming salvation is destined for all alike."[229] The language of 60:17 may reflect the fact that Shalem and Ṣedeq were worshiped as deities in Jebusite Jerusalem.[230]

Finally, 66:12 reads: "I extend *šālôm* to her like a river, and the glory *(kāḇôḏ)* of the nations like an overflowing stream." Here too the *šālôm* accomplished by Yahweh

---

220. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 275.

221. K. Baltzer, *Covenant Formulary* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1971), 12-13 n. 20; but cf. Batto, 187 n. 1.

222. F. B. Knutsen, *RSP,* II, 407.

223. Avishur, *Stylistic Studies,* 537.

224. Schmid, *šalôm,* 81.

225. On the text see Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 319-20.

226. H. Niehr, *Herrschen und Richten. FzB* 54 (1986), 355.

227. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 330.

228. K. Koch, *TLOT,* III, 1046-62.

229. See Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 363.

230. Schmid, *šalôm,* 86 n. 135.

means general well-being, including the alleviation of material poverty when the wealth of the nations flows to Jerusalem (cf. 48:18; 60:5). In this salvific act on Yahweh's part, his motherliness is experienced (v. 13).[231] The ultimate ground and inmost substance of *šālôm* is God's loving favor toward his people.

In Micah we encounter for the first time polemic against the prophets who proclaim *šālôm*. Mic. 3:5 accuses their representatives of crying *šālôm* when they have something to eat, but otherwise declare war *(milḥāmâ)*.[232] "The prophet's words correspond not to Yahweh's instructions, but to the ability of the hearers at any given time to fulfill their personal wishes."[233] When they promise *šālôm,* they mean a general well-being that includes prosperity, happiness, success, health, and respite from enemies; the antithetical *milḥāmâ* probably indicates personal hostility.[234]

Mic. 5:4(5) says of the promised ruler: "He will be *šālôm*." The meaning of the text is ambiguous. Rudolph analyzes *zeh šālôm* as a genitive phrase, which he translates "man of *šālôm,* bringer of *šālôm*."[235] Wolff, on the contrary, interprets the introductory *wᵉhāyâ* as "become real, become effective, effect."[236] "Because he will save Israel from its overpowering enemies, the ruler from Bethlehem will bring about genuine שׁלום." In the first instance, then, *šālôm* means deliverance from enemies; in the context of royal ideology, however, echoes of which are clearly present here (cf. Isa. 9:5-6[6-7]), the full sense of *šālôm* as general well-being probably hovers in the background. Gerleman here interprets *šālôm* in the sense of "penalty, revenge, vengeance" — an explanation that can hardly be correct.[237]

In the book of Jeremiah polemic against the prophets of *šālôm* reappears. For example, 4:10 describes the leadership of Jerusalem, particularly the prophets, as saying: "Ah, Lord Yahweh, how utterly you have deceived us[238] by saying, 'You shall have *šālôm*,' even while the sword is at (our) throat." This passage obviously alludes to the *šālôm* preaching of the false prophets.[239] In this context *šālôm* means freedom from the horrors of war. We encounter Jeremiah's polemic directly in 6:14 and 8:11, where he accuses his opponents of crying "*šālôm, šālôm,* but there is no *šālôm*."

Steck[240] says of this kind of prophecy that it maintains the conception of peace native to the Jerusalem tradition, which knew only irrefragable political and military success for Jerusalem.[241] In 14:13, in a context exhibiting signs of Dtr redaction,[242] we

---

231. F. J. Stendebach, *Dynamik im Wort. FS Katholisches Bibelwerk in Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1983), 147-62.

232. On the text see H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 91.

233. Ibid., 102.

234. Ibid., 102-3.

235. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 88, 91, 98.

236. *Micah,* 147.

237. *TLOT,* III, 1345.

238. *BHS.*

239. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 33.

240. P. 47.

241. R. Rendtorff, *TDNT,* VI, 805-6.

242. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 184.

hear once again polemic against the prophets who promise Judah *šᵉlôm ʾᵉmeṯ*,[243] true, secure *šālôm*. And Jeremiah must reply to Hananiah: "As to the prophet who prophesies *lᵉšālôm*, when the word of the prophet comes true, then it will be known that Yahweh has truly sent the prophet" (28:9-10; see also 23:17).

We also find *šālôm* in the sense of freedom from the horrors of war in 12:12; 25:37; 30:5.

In the setting of a lament that may derive from Dtr tradition,[244] the people appeal to Yahweh: "We hope for *šālôm*, but find no good *(ṭôḇ*]" (14:19; cf. 8:15). Here again *šālôm* means primarily freedom from the threat of enemies, but v. 21 indicates that Yahweh's steadfast love, the endurance of Yahweh's covenant, is also implied.

In 16:5 Yahweh says: "I have taken away my *šālôm* from this people." Because *šālôm* parallels "steadfast love" *(ḥeseḏ)* and "mercy" *(raḥᵃmîm)*, here it probably means "benevolence, kindliness."[245]

Jeremiah's letter in 29:7 contains the command: "Seek the *šālôm* of the land[246] . . . for in its *šālôm* you will find your *šālôm*." Here *šālôm* should be translated "welfare, prosperity. V. 11 (Dtr[247]) cites an oracle of Yahweh in which he says that he has "plans for *šālôm* and not for harm *(rāʿâ)*," plans to give the deportees "a future with hope." Here *šālôm* takes its meaning not only from its contrast with "harm" but also from the perspective of future hope (cf. also 38:4).

In the context of a post-Dtr oracle of salvation,[248] 33:6 says: "I am going to bring them[249] recovery and healing; I will heal them and reveal to them a time of deliverance, of *šālôm* and of *ʾᵉmeṯ*." This last phrase should be understood as an hendiadys, meaning "enduring *šālôm*,"[250] *šālôm* on which one can rely, which will hold good in the future.[251] From the context *šālôm* includes the concepts mentioned, but vv. 7-8 indicate that it also involves a change of political fortunes and the forgiveness of sin. Finally, v. 9 says that all the nations will fear and tremble because of all the good *(ṭôḇâ)* and all the *šālôm* that Yahweh will provide. Here *šālôm* probably means general well-being. The parallelism with *ṭôḇâ* recalls the terminology of Akkadian treaties:[252] the essence of *šālôm* includes the positive relationship of Yahweh to Jerusalem.

In 34:4b-5a Zedekiah is promised that if he capitulates he will not die by the sword but *bᵉšālôm*. This expression indicates a peaceful, natural death, but it also includes honorable burial (cf. Gen. 15:15). In Jer. 43:12 *bᵉšālôm* means "safely, unmolested."

In 15:5 we find the greeting formula *šʾl lᵉšālôm;* 12:5 speaks of an *ʾereṣ šālôm*, a

---

243. But see *BHS*.

244. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, 192-93.

245. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 106, 111; cf. 9:7(8); 20:10; 38:22; Ob. 7.

246. *BHS*.

247. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45*. *WMANT* 52 (1981), 14-16.

248. Ibid., 37.

249. *BHS*.

250. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 214, 216.

251. A. Jepsen, → I, 311.

252. → V, 301-2.

peaceful land without danger; 13:19 says that Judah will be taken into exile *šᵉlômîm*, "wholly" (accusative of mode[253]).

A survey of the occurrences of *šālôm* in the book of Jeremiah shows that the political sense of freedom from the horrors of war and oppression by enemies stands in the foreground.

In Ezekiel we find once more polemic against the prophets of *šālôm*. For example, 13:10 says that these prophets have proclaimed *šālôm* where there is no *šālôm* (cf. v. 16; 7:25). As in Jeremiah, *šālôm* here means freedom from the threat of enemies, a state of political and military security.

In 34:25 we again find the expression *bᵉrîṯ šālôm*, an assurance of *šālôm* (cf. Nu. 25:12; Isa. 54:10). The context (vv. 25-30) makes clear that in this passage *šālôm* includes protection from wild animals, rain and fertility of the land, deliverance from foreign rule, freedom from hunger and humiliation, but ultimately also the covenant between Yahweh and his people. "The word שלום . . . indicates in the first instance the reality of which a covenant in any case consists. Covenant means the establishment of a relationship of well-being between the partners of the covenant. . . . When Yahweh is the covenant partner, this well-being will extend over the whole sphere of life of the nation and will bring about peace there. . . . In Ezekiel there further emerges in particular the motif of the removal of anxiety."[254] (For *lāḇeṭaḥ*, "securely," see Ezk. 28:26; 34:25,27-28; 38:8,11,14; 39:26; Lev. 26:5-6.)

The *bᵉrîṯ šālôm* appears again in Ezk. 37:26, in parallel with *bᵉrîṯ 'ôlām*, "everlasting covenant." Here *šālôm* implies the multiplication of Israel in its own land, but above all God's dwelling in the midst of his people in the reality of the covenant (v. 27).

The relatively few occurrences of the phrase *bᵉrîṯ šālôm* show that it was not a standard expression.[255] It should also be pointed out that Pedersen translates the phrase *bᵉrîṯ šālôm* as "inviolable covenant."[256] Batto sees in *bᵉrîṯ šālôm* a prophetic reshaping of an earlier motif associated with the "dawn of time," found not only in the OT but also elsewhere in the ancient Near East.[257] The original function of this motif was to denote the end of the enmity of the gods toward humans after they rebelled against the gods. The gods ended their attempt to wipe out the human race by binding themselves by an oath to maintain peace and harmony with the human race and all creation. This oath — often called "covenant" in the Bible — was guaranteed by some kind of permanent visible sign, a symbol of the everlasting character of this new "peace treaty." Through the correspondence of the beginning and the end of time, this "covenant of peace" becomes an eschatological entity in the prophets.[258]

If the emendation proposed by Zimmerli is correct, the text of Ezk. 34:29 would

253. *GK*, §118q; Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 92, 96.
254. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 220.
255. Schmid, *šalôm*, 76 n. 109, contra von Rad, *TDNT*, II, 403.
256. J. Pedersen, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients* 3 (1914) 33 n. 2.
257. P. 187.
258. Cf. Batto, 211.

read *maṭṭaʿ šālôm,* "prosperous plantation," with *šālôm* referring to freedom from starvation.[259]

In Hab. 2:9 Yahweh says of the rebuilt temple that it is his will to give *šālôm* in this place. In this context *šālôm* means "primarily material welfare . . . , but given the breadth of the term . . . this expectation is capable of being interpreted in a more profound sense."[260] Eisenbeis understands *šālôm* here as well as in Nah. 2:1(1:15) and Zec. 8:19 as the maintenance of cultic observance, but this interpretation makes no sense.[261]

In Zechariah, too, *šālôm* is linked with the Second Temple. In 8:10, for instance, we find the statement that when the work of rebuilding began, "there was no *šālôm* from the foe for those who went out or came in," no protection from hostile threats. In v. 12 Yahweh proclaims: "I will sow *šālôm*."[262] Here *šālôm* probably means the fertility of the land. With reference to the motif of "planting *šālôm*" (Ezk. 34:29; Zec. 8:12; cf. Hos. 2:18-25[16-23]; Lev. 26:6), Batto cites an Ugaritic text[263] in which Baal orders Anat, "Sink harmony into the earth, pour peace into the earth's interior, much love into the interior of the field."[264] In the mythological context of *berîṯ šālôm,* he believes that this secondary motif signifies an expression of trust in divine mercy to forgive human transgressions and bring peace and harmony into a world torn by sin and violence.[265]

In Zec. 8:16 the people are called upon to practice *mišpāṭ šālôm.* "The intended purpose of law . . . is שָׁלוֹם. This means not simply making peace between contending parties, but promoting the prosperity of the people."[266] In v. 19 the people are exhorted to "love truth *(ʾemeṯ)* and *šālôm.*" In parallel with *ʾemeṯ, šālôm* most likely means a social environment that can be described as "peace and beneficial effects of all sorts."[267] In 6:13 the phrase *ʿaṣaṯ šālôm* should probably be translated "peaceable agreement."[268]

In a "messianic" context 9:10 declares that the awaited ruler will command *šālôm* for the nations. This promise is preceded by the destruction of chariots, war horses, and battle bows.[269] Since Judah possessed no independent military potential at the time when this passage originated, the text can only mean that the coming king will destroy the symbols of foreign domination[270] — i.e., *šālôm* following a successful war of liber-

---

259. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 211.

260. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 43.

261. Pp. 183-84.

262. *BHS;* Rudolph, *Sacharja 1–8,* 141, speaks of "successful sowing."

263. *KTU* 1.3, III, 13-14.

264. Following J. Aistleitner, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra* (²1964), 27.

265. Batto, 198, 205, 211.

266. Rudolph, *Sacharja 1–8,* 150.

267. Ibid., 151.

268. *HAL,* I, 867; cf. Weinfeld, → II, 257.

269. On the text see *BHS.*

270. K. Elliger, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi. ATD* XXV (⁷1975), 149-50.

ation! Since, however, this *šālôm* is for the nations, it must refer not just to freedom from foreign domination, but to a just order embracing all nations, general well-being. Of course certain elements of the royal ideology live on here, but they are given a new eschatological interpretation.[271]

Mal. 2:5 defines the covenant of Yahweh with Levi more precisely as life *(ḥayyîm)* and *šālôm*. Here *šālôm* probably suggests life in all its fullness, an untroubled and unimpaired existence. Then v. 6 describes Levi as having walked before Yahweh "*bᵉšālôm* and uprightness *(mîšôr*]." Here *šālôm* means the integrity of the way, of religious and ethical conduct, grounded in harmony with God.[272]

A survey of the occurrences of *šālôm* in the prophetic literature casts doubt on the conclusion of Eisenbeis that in the majority of cases *šālôm* has a religious meaning.[273] Not every occurrence with Yahweh as logical subject involves per se a specifically religious or theological statement, e.g., when *šālôm* means freedom from affliction at the hands of enemies or the fertility of the land.

4. *Psalms and Wisdom Literature.* In the Psalter *šālôm* occurs in a wide variety of contexts. It can mean the security *(beṭaḥ)* given by Yahweh (4:9[8][274]), strength and power (29:11), a tranquil relationship with Yahweh (35:27[275]), possession of the land and the opportunity to enjoy its abundance and fertility without hindrance (37:11), soundness and health (38:4[3]), freedom from the threat of enemies (55:19[18]), prosperity (73:3), protection from misfortune (119:165), the quintessence of blessing (147:14).

In the context of a didactic sapiential poem, 34:15(14) exhorts: "Depart from evil, and do good; seek *šālôm*, and pursue it." Against the background of the correlation between actions and their consequences, this text says that doing what is right brings about the well-being of the righteous. Since the order of the world "is understood fundamentally as a beneficial whole, conduct pursuant to that order . . . results in *šālôm*, well-being."[276] Within a synthetic mode of thought, *šālôm* thus implies right conduct. The thrust of 37:37 is similar.[277] Gerleman's interpretation ("the end for a person is requital"[278]) is, in my opinion, untenable; note Syr. *gabrā dašlāmā*, "peaceable man," and LXX *ánthrōpos eirēnikós*.[279]

In 72:3 and 7 *šālôm* appears in the context of royal ideology. V. 3 asks that the mountains yield *šālôm* and the hills *ṣᵉḏāqâ*.[280] The two terms are probably used synonymously; they both refer to the right order of the world, manifested not least in the fer-

---

271. Schmid, *šalôm*, 76-77.
272. Rudolph, *Maleachi*, 266.
273. P. 159.
274. On the text see H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 150.
275. Ibid., 394-95.
276. Schmid, *šalôm*, 54.
277. See *BHS*.
278. *TLOT*, III, 1345.
279. *HAL*, II, 1509.
280. On the text see *BHS;* H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 75.

tility of the land, an order for which the king is responsible (cf. vv. 1-2). V. 7 asks that in the days of the king *ṣeḏeq*[281] may flourish and *šālôm* abound. Here also the two terms mean the right order of the world, which includes both right conduct and general well-being.

In Ps. 85 *šālôm* appears in two crucial passages. In v. 9(8) a cult prophet speaks:[282] "I wish to hear what Yahweh will say. Does he not speak *šālôm* to his people and to his faithful?"[283] "שׁלום is in the most comprehensive sense the epitome of the successful, undisturbed, and salvific effectiveness — not a condition but a dynamic execution. . . . The prophet becomes aware of a salvific gesture of Yahweh toward his people."[284] The last stich of v. 9(8), "they shall not remain without hope,"[285] shows that *šālôm* also embodies a positive perspective on the future. V. 11(10) makes a weighty statement: "Steadfast love *(ḥesed)* and faithfulness *(ʾemeṯ)* meet, righteousness *(ṣeḏeq)* and *šālôm* kiss":[286] four terms that are closely related since they are all relational, describing proper conduct toward others, from which the state of well-being arises. "The perception of the dynamic element that is inherent in OT concepts of salvation presses on toward lifelike depiction" of "salvific powers in the form of living beings."[287] Behind the dyad *ṣeḏeq* and *šālôm* probably stand ancient names of deities, as in 72:3,7.[288]

In 120:6-7 the psalmist looks back to a time when he had to dwell among people[289] who hate *šālôm*. While he spoke for *šālôm* and justice (*kēn*[290]), they were for war. The antithesis shows that here *šālôm* means "peace."

In 122:6-8 *šālôm* occurs three times. V. 6 reads: "Pray for *(š'l)* the *šālôm* of Jerusalem; may those you love you have security *(šalwâ)*."[291] The verb *š'l* evokes the situation of a greeting. The parallel noun *šalwâ* shows that in this context *šālôm* means primarily "security, tranquility" in the political and military sense. The same holds true for vv. 7-8. It is worth noting that the words *šālôm* and *šalwâ* play on the name "Jerusalem."[292]

In 125:5 and 128:6 we find the wish "*šālôm* be upon Israel" — "a wish of blessing for the chosen people of God in which the good fortune of the individual is enclosed."[293] Here *šālôm* incorporates security and Yahweh's protection, freedom from foreign domination (in contrast to fate of the wicked), a successful life (cf. 125:1-5a), productive labor, and offspring (cf. 128:2-3) — in short, everything worth striving for.

---

281. *BHS.*
282. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 176-77.
283. On the text see ibid., 173.
284. Ibid., 177.
285. On the emendation see ibid., 173.
286. For a different translation see ibid., 172.
287. Ibid., 177.
288. See III.6 below; also Pope, 307; Schmid, *šalôm,* 87 n. 138.
289. *BHS.*
290. *BHS.*
291. See *BHS.*
292. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 435.
293. Ibid., 459.

Some passages use *šālôm* in characterizing the wicked. For example, 28:3 speaks of those who hypocritically speak *šālôm* to their neighbors. Here *šālôm* is to be understood adverbially[294] in the sense of "benevolently, affably." In 35:20 the psalmist's enemies do not speak *šālôm* but rather conceive deceitful designs, planning actions that are not wholesome but harmful. In 41:10(9) (like Jer. 20:10), the psalmist's personal opponent is described as *'îš š^elômî,* "man of my favor, my friend." The additional qualifications "in whom I trusted" and "who ate of my bread" show that *šālôm* can also be reflected in trust and table fellowship.[295]

In 55:21(20) *š^elōmāyw* should be emended to *šōl^emô* (act. ptcp. of *šlm*), "his friend" (cf. 7:5[4]).[296] In 69:23(22) *š^elômîm* should be emended to *šalmêhem,* "their sacrificial feasts."[297]

Eisenbeis defines *šālôm* in 4:9(8); 37:11,37; and 55:19 as "inner peace."[298] This interpretation cannot be correct, if only because it is at odds with the ancient Israelite understanding of the human person, which does not distinguish "inner" from "outer," but always views the individual as a totality.[299]

In the book of Job the most significant occurrence of *šālôm* is in 25:2b, where Bildad affirms that God "makes *('śh) šālôm* in his heights." Of the fearsome dominion of God (v. 2a), Fohrer says: "While these words (like 21:22) probably now mean that God rules the hosts of heaven, thus maintaining peace in his 'heights' . . . we still catch glimpses of the mythological notion of a theomachy engaged in by the deity in the heights of heaven . . . until he could make a covenant of peace with his subjugated opponents. . . . Thus he maintains order and harmony in heaven by exercising his dominion."[300]

In 5:24 *šālôm* is used as an adjective meaning "intact, safe."[301] The same is true in 21:9. In 15:21 Eliphaz says that the destroyer comes upon the wicked *baššālôm.* He lives "in constant anticipation that one day the 'destroyer' will invade the peace in which he outwardly flourishes."[302]

In Prov. 3:2 the wisdom teacher says of his commandments: "Length of days and years of life and *šālôm* they will multiply for you." As the context suggests, *šālôm* here encompasses a long and full life, the experience of loyalty *(ḥeseḏ)* and faithfulness *('^emeṯ)* (v. 3), and favor *(ḥēn)* and good repute *(śēḵel-ṭôḇ)* in the sight of God and of people (v. 4) — in short, general well-being in both the individual and the social sphere. In 3:17 we read that the ways of wisdom are *šālôm.* The word is used adjecti-

294. *GK,* §118a-c.

295. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 432.

296. *BHS.*

297. *BHS;* Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 58-59.

298. Pp. 195-96.

299. F. J. Stendebach, "Theologische Anthropologie des Jahwisten" (diss., Bonn, 1970), 248-80; for a summary discussion of the problems see also Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 82-83.

300. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 375.

301. Ibid., 133.

302. Ibid., 274, citing R. Gordis, *HUCA* 22 (1949) 182-83.

vally, and probably means not just "safe"[303] but also more generally "salubrious." Whoever follows wisdom will enjoy a successful life. In 12:20 we are told: "Deceit is in the heart of those who plan evil, but those who counsel *šālôm* have joy." As the antithesis shows, *šālôm* here means what is good and salubrious. The promise of joy to those who give good counsel indicates that, in the context of synthetic thought, joy is an aspect of *šālôm* (cf. Isa. 55:12).

In Eccl. 3:8 *šālôm* in the sense of "peace" appears as the opposite of war.

In Cant. 8:10 the bride describes herself: "I am a wall, and my breasts are like towers, but in his eyes I am as one who causes *šālôm* to go forth." "In her own eyes, the speaker is a proud and valiant city; but in the eyes of her lover she is like a besieged city ready to surrender, which 'sends forth peace,' i.e., sues for peace."[304]

As in many of the Psalms, in Lam. 3:17 *šālôm* means "a thriving, untroubled, and complete life."[305]

In Est. 2:11 *šālôm* clearly means "well-being," but its interpretation in 9:30 is difficult. There it is said of Esther's Purim letter that copies were sent to all the Jews of the Persian Empire: "words of *šālôm* and *'emet*." Gerleman translates the phrase as "pleasing and authoritative words."[306] Meinhold translates: "things of peace and truth."[307] Eisenbeis suspects a technical term meaning "legally binding document."[308] In the light of the Esther story, however, it seems reasonable to understand the expression as "words of welfare and security (for the Jews)" (cf. also 10:3).

The formula in Dnl. 10:19 recalls Jgs. 6:23: "Do not fear. . . . *šālôm* to you," best translated "Hail [lit. 'well-being'] to you." Eisenbeis understands the greeting formula as expressing an "actual transference of strength"; the words "be strong, be strong," that follow and Daniel's response, "You have strengthened me," support this interpretation.[309]

When we survey all the texts that use *šālôm,* we may agree with Gerleman that there is no sharp distinction between a secular and a theological realm of usage of *šālôm*.[310] This is not because — as Gerleman thinks — the concept of payment and requital in the context of the correlation between act and consequence is intimately related to faith in Yahweh, who serves as the real guarantor of this correlation. It is grounded instead in the simple fact that ancient Israel knows nothing of a secular world, that for Israel all reality — including *šālôm* in its various manifestations — is sustained by Yahweh. It is possible, however, to speak of a greater or lesser theological content of the term. Gerleman is correct in stating — contra Durham — that *šālôm* is certainly not a cultic term with specific reference to Yahweh's cultic presence.

---

303. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 36.
304. O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. tr. 1994), 279; cf. Dt. 20:10.
305. Kraus, *Klagelieder. BK* XX (^{3}1968), 61.
306. G. Gerleman, *Esther. BK* XXI (1973), 141-42.
307. A. Meinhold, *Esther. ZBK* 13 (1983), 94.
308. Eisenbeis, 207-8.
309. Ibid., 214.
310. *TLOT,* III, 1346-47.

5. *Aramaic.* In the Aramaic portions of the OT *šᵉlām* appears in the context of the greeting formula. In Dnl. 3:31(4:1) and 6:26 we find the formula *šᵉlāmḵôn yiśgēʾ,* "May your well-being be great." Simple *šᵉlām* appears in Ezr. 4:17, *šᵉlāmāʾ ḵōllāʾ,* "all well-being," in 5:7.

It remains to discuss the form *bišlām* in Ezr. 4:7, which is often translated "in agreement."[311] Rudolph sees in *bšlm* a garbling of *bîrûšālēm;*[312] Gunneweg correctly suggests a personal name.[313] Torrey conjectures a Babylonian name Bel-shallim.[314]

6. *Proper Names.* The best-known personal name using the root *šlm* is *šᵉlōmōh,* which appears 162 times.[315] According to Noth,[316] this name is a hypocoristicon, in which the unnamed deity is the subject and *šālôm* the predicate, with the hypocoristic ending *-ō.* Stamm considers the final *ō* a personal suffix, so that the name means "his (David's) peace" or better "his (the dead person's) survival," indicating that the departed (cf. 2 S. 12:18) is alive and well in the newborn.[317] This would make "Solomon" a cognomen.[318]

The name *ʾaḇšālôm/ʾᵃbîšālôm* should also be understood as a cognomen: "the/my father is unimpaired";[319] the *î* may be the remnant of an archaic case ending.[320] A comparable name *apšlm* appears on a 5th/4th-century ostracon from Ezion-geber,[321] and the name *abšlm* appears in the Lihyanic inscriptions from northern Hejaz.[322] Other names with the element *šālôm* are *šᵉlōmôṯ, šᵉlōmî* (on a 7th/6th-century jar from Hazor),[323] *šᵉlōmîṯ, šᵉlômām,* and *šᵉlûmîʾēl.*

Gerleman interprets *šᵉlōmōh* as "his substitute," *ʾaḇšālôm/ʾᵃbîšālôm* as "(my) father is sufficient," and *šᵉlûmîʾēl* as "my satisfaction is God."[324]

Other names are formed with the piel of *šlm:*[325] *šillēm, šellemyâ/šellemyāhû, mᵉšullām/mᵉšullemeṯ, mᵉšellemyâ/mᵉšellemyāhû,*[326] *mᵉšillēmôṯ/mᵉšillēmûṯ.* It is uncertain whether the name *šallûm* should be understood actively ("replacer") or passively ("replaced"); it may be a hypocoristic form of *šellemyâ/šellemyāhû* or *mᵉšellemyâ/*

---

311. *KBL*², 980; H. H. Schaeder, *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl.* 6 (1929/30), 214-15.

312. W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia. HAT* I/20 (1949), 34.

313. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Esra. KAT* XIX/1 (1985), 83 n. 7c; cf. NRSV.

314. C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (1910, repr. New York, 1970), 172-73.

315. *HAL,* II, 1540.

316. *IPN,* 165 n. 4.

317. *TZ* 16:294-96; idem, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," 75.

318. See also *HAL,* II, 1540-41.

319. Stamm, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," 67 n. 40.

320. *IPN,* 35, 67-68.

321. Pope, 307.

322. D. S. Margoliouth, *Relations Between Arabs and Israelites Prior to the Rise of Islam* (London, 1924), 13.

323. M. Dothan, *ʿAtiqot* 3 (1961) 181-83.

324. *TLOT,* III, 1346; *ZAW* 85:13.

325. *IPN,* 174.

326. *IPN,* 31, 145.

mᵉšellemy*āhû.*[327] Names using the piel of *šlm* are attested in the late preexilic period and the postexilic period (2 K. 21:19; 1 Ch. 9:17,19,21,31; 26:1,2,9,14; Ezr. 2:42//Neh. 7:45; 12:25), as well as at Lachish,[328] Elephantine (Shellemiah, son of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria[329]), and on seals (e.g., the 7th/6th-century seal of Hoshayahu, son of Shelemyahu[330]).[331]

The toponym *šālēm* appears in Gen. 14:18 and Ps. 76:3(2), possibly as an alias for Jerusalem.[332] Mackay[333] points out, however, that an inscription of Ramses II lists a Sherem/Shalem among the cities of northern Palestine.[334] Gen. 33:18 may provide evidence for a *šālēm* in the vicinity of Shechem.[335] If so, the *šālēm* of Ps. 76:3(2) should be identified with the site in northern Palestine rather than Jerusalem. Kraus is probably correct in concluding that the *šālēm* of Gen. 14:18 is an ancient term for Jerusalem.[336] There is, however, ample evidence for a northern *šālēm,* including Eusebius, Epiphanius, Ambrose, and the Madeba Map.[337] Smith[338] understands the *meleḵ šālēm* of Gen. 14:18 adjectivally in the sense of "allied king" — citing the Amarna letters,[339] where he interprets *šal-ma-at* as meaning "submissive, subservient," and Arab. *salima* IV *('aslama),* "submit, surrender." Melchizedek, he argues, is a tributary vassal with whom Abraham makes a treaty, a "subject king."[340]

The name "Jerusalem" is to be interpreted as "foundation of the god Shalem."[341] The form *urušalim* in the Amarna letters is influenced by Akkadian or Sumerian. The element *yērû* is probably based on the verbal root *yry,* "found."[342] Another possibility is the root *yrh* III, "show, teach, instruct," in which case the name would mean "*šālēm* gives instruction."[343] In any case the god *šālēm* has a special relationship with Jerusalem, so that the personal names "Solomon" and "Absalom" may perhaps be

327. Stamm, *TZ* 16:285-86.

328. *KAI* 197.7.

329. E. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen militär-kolonie zu Elephantine* (Leipzig, 1911), pl. 2; *AP* 13.20; 19.4,6; 22.41,85,88,97,116.

330. A. Reifenberg, *PEQ* 70 (1938) 114, no. 3.

331. On the subject see also Stamm, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," 73-75; M. Dothan, *'Atiqot* 3 (1961) 184; M. H. Silverman, *Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine. AOAT* 217 (1985), 182; M. Weippert, *ZDPV* 95 (1979) 175 n. 7.

332. *HAL,* II, 1539.

333. Pp. 122-24.

334. See also J. H. Breasted, ed., *Nineteenth Dynasty. ARE* 3 (1906), 159; Smith, 141.

335. For a discussion of this verse see C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 528; L. Wächter, *ZDPV* 84 (1968) 63-72.

336. *Psalms 60–150,* 109.

337. References in Mackay.

338. P. 143.

339. EA 226:7.

340. Smith, 145.

341. De Liagre Böhl, 382; Nyberg, 352; Porteous, 239; V. Maag, *Scheizerische theologische Umschau* 34 (1964) 19; Gray, "Desert God," 77; Fohrer, *TDNT,* VII, 298-99; H. Ringgren, → VI, 348.

342. J. Léwy, *RHR* 110 (1934) 60-61.

343. Stolz, 181-82.

theophorous.[344] If the identification of *šālēm* with *ʿaṯtr*[345] and *mlk* is correct, there would be traces of evidence for his worship in Jerusalem (1 K. 11:7; 2 K. 23:5,10).[346] This would provide evidence for the pre-Israelite period if the city name in EA 290:16 is to be read *bît šulmāni.*[347]

De Liagre Böhl cites an Assyrian list of deities[348] in which an Ishtar Uru-Silimma appears, with the name *šul-ma-ni-t(u).*[349] The same name appears in a building inscription of Tukulti-Ninurta I.[350] This goddess was probably a feminine counterpart to the god Sha/ulman — probably an epithet of the god Ninurta — and stands in some relationship to Jerusalem.[351]

IV. Derivatives. The adj. → שׁלם *šālēm* occurs frequently. The pl. *šalmōnîm,* "gifts" (Isa. 1:23), derives from the piel of *šlm.* It refers to a "repayment for the 'service' of a judge"[352] (cf. Akk. *šulmânu*[353]).

V. Deuterocanonical Literature. In deuterocanonical literature *šālôm* is represented by Gk. *eirḗnē.*

In Tob. 7:12 (LXX^S),13 (LXX^S); 13:15 (LXX^S), the word means "well-being, health"; it appears in a dismissal in Tob. 10:12-13 (LXX^S). On Tob. 12:17 cf. Jgs. 6:23 and Dnl. 10:19; on Tob. 14:2(LXX^S) cf. Gen. 15:15. As the opposite of war, *eirḗnē* appears in Tob. 14:4.

Jth. 7:15 says that the inhabitants of Bethulia did not receive Holofernes *en eirḗnē,* probably meaning "with an offer of surrender" (cf. Dt. 20:10-12; Cant. 8:10). When Jth. 15:8 describes the leaders of Israel as wanting to speak *eirḗnē* with Judith, this expression ("wish good fortune") corresponds to Heb. *dibber šālôm ʿim* (cf. Ps. 28:3).[354] The dismissal formula appears in Jth. 8:35.

In Ad. Est. 13:2 and 16:8 (LXX Est. 3:13b; 8:12h) *eirḗnē* means political peace.

Wis. 3:3 says of the righteous departed that they are *en eirḗnē.* In context this means "a happy existence after death"[355] — a totally new aspect. Wis. 14:22 says that idolaters call the great evils into which the pagan cults lead *eirḗnē,* best translated "beneficial, good."

---

344. E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das AT* (Giessen, 1903), 224.

345. See II.3 above.

346. Gray, "Desert God," 78-80.

347. See also the Assyrian list of deities cited by Léwy, 519-20.

348. *KAV,* no. 145, vo. 6.

349. De Liagre Böhl, 380.

350. *CT,* XXXVI, pl. 10, 1, 1; 11, 1, 21; 12, 1,1, 7; cf. *KAV* no. 72, ro. 10, vo. 19; no. 42, II, 20 (see V. Scheil, *RA* 14 [1897] 171ff.); no. 78, ro. 12.

351. De Liagre Böhl, 380-81; Fohrer, *TDNT,* VII, 298-99.

352. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 66.

353. Eisenbeis, 351.

354. E. Zenger, "Judith," *Historische und legendische Erzählungen. JSHRZ* I/6 (1981), 515-16.

355. A. Schmitt, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Würzburg, 1986), 57.

In Sir. 1:18; 38:8 (G = Greek; H = Hebrew differs); 41:14 (G); 47:16 (G); 50:23 (G; H differs[356]), *eirḗnē* may be translated "well-being, health, contentment, happiness." In Sir. 13:17 (H) = 13:18 (G),[357] it may be understood as a state of social harmony between classes; in 47:13 it means political peace (cf. 1 K. 5:4). Sir. 26:2 (G; H differs[358]) and 44:4 may be compared to Gen. 15:15, and 45:24 to Nu. 25:12.

In Bar. 3:13-14; 4:20; 6:2(= Ep. Jer.), *eirḗnē* means "well-being, happiness, salvation" (also in the sense of "freedom from the threat of enemies"; cf. Bar. 4:18,21). In Bar. 5:4 Jerusalem is given a new name: *eirḗnē dikaiosýnēs,* a reference to the state of salvation brought about by righteousness.

The prepositional phrase *en eirḗnē* or *met' eirḗnēs* = *bᵉšālôm,* usually in combination with a verb of motion, appears in 1 Mc. 5:54; 7:35; 10:66; 12:4,52; 16:10. Peace in the political sense — in contrast to war — is meant in 1 Mc. 6:49,58; 7:13; 9:70; 10:4; 11:51; 13:37,40 (cf. Josh. 9;15). When 1 Mc. 8:20,22 speaks of *symmachía kaí eirḗnē,* "military alliance and peace alliance,"[359] the reference is clearly to a pact promising military assistance. In 1 Mc. 7:28 *met' eirḗnēs* probably means "with peaceful intent" (cf. 1 K. 20:18).

In 1 Mc. 14:8 the inhabitants of Judah are described as having been able to till their land *met' eirḗnēs.* Here *eirḗnē* may be translated "well-being, prosperity," which implies respite from enemies (v. 4) and the extension of Judah's own power (vv. 5-7) as well as the fertility of the land and affluence (vv. 9-10; cf. also 12:22). The same meaning is present in v. 11, where the context goes on to speak of endeavors on behalf of the law and the temple (vv. 14-15). All these aspects are comprehended in the concept of *eirḗnē* (cf. Lev. 26:4ff.; 1 K. 5:4-5).

In 2 Mc. 1:1 *eirḗnē* appears in the salutation formula of the first introductory letter. In the blessing that follows, v. 4 reads: "May he open your heart to his law and his commandments, and may he bring *eirḗnē*." Here *eirḗnē* probably means in the broadest sense the salvation vouchsafed by God — an explicitly theological meaning. In 2 Mc. 3:1 and 4:6 (cf. also 12:12; 14:10), *eirḗnē* is to be understood as freedom from external threats and internal dissension, a state of political peace both foreign and domestic.

Without exception, the adj. *eirēnikós* is associated with nouns or verbs of speaking, e.g., *lógos* (Jth. 3:1; Ad. Est. 15:8 [LXX Est. 5:1e]; 1 Mc. 1:30; 5:48; 7:10,15,27; 10:3,47; 11:2). The syntagm *lógoi eirēnikoí* means "peaceful, friendly words." We find *eirēnikós* as the object of a verb in Jth. 7:24, in the context of a charge made by the population of Bethulia, accusing the city's leaders of not having sent a deputation to the Assyrian army to sue for peace. Sir. 4:8 urges answering *eirēniká,* "friendly words," to the poor.[360] In 2 Mc. 5:25 Apollonius reports that in Jerusalem he "pretended to be peaceably disposed" *(tón eirēnikón hypokritheís).*

356. G. Sauer, "Jesus Sirach," *JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 633.

357. On the text see Sauer, 538.

358. Sauer, 568-69.

359. K.-D. Schunck, "1. Makkabäerbuch," *JSHRZ* I/4 (1980), 332.

360. For a different interpretation see Sauer, "Jesus Sirach," 514, who interprets the phrase as a greeting; cf. BDAG, 288; Foerster, *TDNT,* II, 418.

The adv. *eirēnikṓs* appears primarily in the context of meeting and greeting (1 Mc. 5:25; 7:29,33). In 2 Mc. 10:12 it is reported that Ptolemy Macron tried to settle a matter *eirēnikṓs*, "peacefully."

Our survey of the deuterocanonical texts shows that they reflect Hebrew usage almost everywhere.[361]

VI. Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Judaism. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šālôm* occurs many times. The lexeme has the meaning "well-being" in 1QS 2:4 (cf. Nu. 6:26),9,13 (cf. Dt. 29:18[19]); 3:15; 4:7; 1QM 1:9; 11:9; 13:13; 17:1,7 (//*berākâ;* but cf. 4QMᵃ 11 2:18); 1QH 1:17; 7:15; 9:11,33; 11:27; 13:5,17-18; 15:16; 18:30; 1QSb 3:5 (cf. Nu. 6:26),21; 1Q34 1 1; 1Q36 1 2; 1Q51 1 4; CD 6:21.

Some occurrences merit special attention. In 1QM 3:5 the inscription on the trumpets of the camps reads: "*šālôm* of God in the camps of his holy ones." In 3:11 the inscription on the trumpets of the path of return reads: "Exultation of God *bimšôḇ šālôm* ['with a successful return']). In 4:14 one of the inscriptions on the banners is "*šālôm* of God."

Gerleman[362] suggests that in some passages *šlwm* should be read as *šillûm*, "requital," e.g., 1QM 17:1, in the light of 1QM 4:12.[363]

On 1QM 12:3 cf. Nu. 25:12; Isa. 54:10; Ezk. 34:25; 37:26; Sir. 45:24. On 1QM fr. 3:3 cf. Prov. 3:17.

In 1QH 2:15 the "teacher of righteousness" says that he has become a man of *šālôm* to all true observers. The antithesis to "a man of dissent to those who spread fallacies" in the previous line shows that here *šālôm* means harmony within the community.

The occurrences of *šālôm* in 11QT 62:6-8 reflect Dt. 20:10-12.

The adj. *šālēm* appears in 1QH 16:7,17; and CD 1:10 in the phrase *lēḇ šālôm* (cf. 1 K. 8:61; 15:14; etc.).

In conclusion, we may say that in the Dead Sea Scrolls *šālôm* is used with the same meaning as in the OT.

With respect to the occurrences of *šālôm* in rabbinic literature, we shall note only that it tends to become a parallel concept to *berākâ*, "blessing." The beginnings of this development may be observed already in the OT and the Dead Sea Scrolls. As in the late strata of the OT, *šālôm* refers to the well-being and salvation of the eschaton or the messianic age.[364] But *šālôm* can also denote peace in contrast to conflict between individuals and nations. "One might almost say that the role which peacemaking assumes plays among the Rabbis comes nearest to the NT concept of love and takes the place in later Judaism [*sic*] which the requirement of love occupies in the NT."[365]

In addition, *šālôm* defines the relationship between God and humankind. The designation "God of peace" (T. Dan 5:2) represents God "not only as the one who gives

---

361. See I.2 above.
362. *TLOT*, III, 1348.
363. See also Scharbert, 226 n. 95.
364. Foerster, 409.
365. Foerster, 409; see also Thiessen, 611.

peace but also as the one who makes the entire relationship between God and humankind a relationship of peace, if humankind creates the necessary conditions. . . . To create the sphere of peace, God has appointed an 'angel of peace' as 'the mediator between God and humankind, for the peace of Israel' (6:2). . . . 'Peace' in this sense is to be understood as the link joining heaven and earth."[366]

Stendebach

366. Thiessen, 612.

שָׁלַח *šālaḥ*

I. 1. Overview of Usages; 2. History; 3. Theological Interest. II. "Extend": 1. Hand; 2. Other Objects. III. "Send": 1. Three Actants; 2. Second Actant Omitted; 3. Third Actant Omitted; 4. Second and Third Actants Omitted. IV. Piel in Trivalent Constructions. V. Piel in Bivalent Constructions. VI. Summary. VII. Niphal, Pual, Hiphil. VIII. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šālaḥ. U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum. BZAW* 192 (1990), esp. 148-50; J. Bernard, "Le *Šaliaḥ*," in H. Cazelles, ed., *La vie de la Parole. FS P. Grelot* (Paris, 1987), 409-20; T. Booij, "The Role of Darkness in Psalm CV 28," *VT* 39 (1989) 209-14; E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch. BZAW* 189 (1990), esp. 22-28; H. von Campenhausen, "Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff," *ST* 1 (1948) 96-130; M. Delcor, "Le vocabulaire juridique, cultuel et mystique de l''initiation' dans la secte de Qumrân," in H. Bardtke, ed., *Qumran-Probleme* (Berlin, 1963), 109-34; idem and E. Jenni, "שׁלח *šlḥ* to send," *TLOT,* III, 1330-34; F. C. Fensham, "Das Nicht-Haftbar-Sein im Bundesbuch im Lichte der altorientalischen Rechtstexte," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 17-37; G. Fischer, *Jahwe, unser Gott. OBO* 91 (1989), esp. 72-76; J. P. Floss, *Jahwe dienen — Götter dienen. BBB* 45 (1975), esp. 181-235; E. Grässer, "Mose und Jesus," *Der Alte Bund im Neuen. WUNT* 35 (1985), 290-311; M. Held, "שֶׁלַח (Job 33,18) 'Death,'" *JANES* 5 (1973) 974; W. Horbury, "Extirpation and Excommunication," *VT* 35 (1985) 13-38; P. Humbert, "'Entendre la main,'" *VT* 12 (1962) 383-95; O. Keel, *Wirkmächtige Siegeszeichen im AT. OBO* 5 (1974), esp. 153-60; C. Levine, "The Concept of 'Sheliḥut Yad' in the Mechilta de Rashbi," *Bar-Ilan Annual* 18/19 (1981) 21-22, 99-117; O. Loretz, "Der Gott *šlḥ,* he. *šlḥ* I und *šlḥ* II," *UF* 7 1975) 584-85; B. Z. Luria, "Gezer — *šilluḥîm* for Pharaoh's Daughter," *BethM* 28 (1982/83) 103-6; I. Meyer, *Jeremia und die falschen Propheten. OBO* 13 (1977), esp. 55-56; G. del Olmo Lete, "'*'aḥar šillûḥêhā'* (Ex 18:2)," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 414-16; K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀποστέλλω," *TDNT,* I, 398-447, esp. 400-403, 413-20; W. Richter, *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte. FRLANT* 101 (1970), esp. 156-58; G. Rinaldi, "*šillûḥîm* (Esodo 18,2) 'dimissioni, congedo,'" *BeO* 27 (1985) 322; J. Roloff, "Apostel/Apostolat/Apostolizität I. NT,"

I. 1. *Overview of Usages.* "In all usages of the verb *šlḥ* an obj. is set in motion away from the actor. If the obj. remains linked to the actor, the meaning can be rendered in Eng. (a) "to extend (one's hand/staff)"; chief meaning "to send, dispatch," which implies a complete separation, can differentiate between the dispatch (b) of an obj. perceived as passive and (c) of a (usually per.) obj. that actively executes a mission."[1]

Within this fundamental distinction between *šlḥ yd* ("stretch out")[2] and *šlḥ* + personal direct object ("send"),[3] each of the individual meanings of the root in the qal exhibits its own typical semantic and syntagmatic structural pattern. The full trivalent realization of the primary meaning ("send") names a subject, a direct object, and a goal or purpose of the action.[4] Other constructions express a specialized meaning by deliberately omitting the direct object, the indirect object (goal or purpose), or both.

When the direct object is omitted, for example, the meaning becomes "send messages/messengers";[5] when the goal or purpose is omitted, the meaning (with God as subject) becomes "send prophets/deliverers";[6] when both are omitted, the meaning becomes "use all means at one's disposal."[7]

An essential mark of all occurrences of *šālaḥ* qal is the telic aspect of the usage of the root. The sending or stretching out always has a specific goal, a precisely stated purpose. This aspect distinguishes *šālaḥ yāḏ,* for example, from such expressions as *nāṭâ yāḏ.*[8] All the more important, therefore, are the instances of *šlḥ* in which the statement of the goal or purpose is omitted. Since this aspect is indispensable for an understanding of *šlḥ,*[9] we must assume, except in cases of stylistic ellipsis, that the omission of the goal is deliberate and signals a specialized meaning. Such a specialized use of *šlḥ* in the sense of "extend" can be identified only in a very few instances of metaphorical language (Isa. 58:9; Ezk. 8:17; Joel 4:13[Eng. 3:13]).[10] In the case of *šlḥ* + personal

---

TRE, III, 430-35, esp. 430-33; A. Rubinstein, "שׁלח — שָׁלַח," *Leš* 28 (1973) 11-22; J. Scharbert, "Ehe und Eheschliessung in der Rechtssprache des Pentateuch und beim Chronisten," in G. Braulik, ed., *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 213-26; K. Scholtissek, *Vollmacht im AT und Judentum. Paderborner theologische Studien* 24 (1993), esp. 129-38; H. Schweizer, *Elischa in den Kriegen. SANT* 37 (1974), esp. 187-92; H. P. Stähli, "'Da schickte sie ihre Magd . . .' (Ex. 2,5)," *WuD* 17 (1983) 17-54; P. Weimar, *Die Berufung des Mose. OBO* 32 (1980), esp. 159-60, 368-71, 376-77; P. B. Wodecki, "*šlḥ* dans le livre d'Isaïe," *VT* 34 (1984) 482-88; A. S. van der Woude, "I Reg 20,34," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 188-91.

1. Delcor and Jenni, 1331.
2. See II below.
3. See III below.
4. See II.1 below.
5. See III.2 below.
6. See III.3 below.
7. See III.4 below.
8. See II.1 below.
9. See II.1 and III.1 below.
10. See II.2 below.

object, the omission of (only) the goal signals the specialized meaning of divine "commissioning" of a prophet or deliverer.[11]

This analysis has certain consequences for the use of the root *šlḥ* in the so-called (pre)prophetic call schema and in the exegesis of Ex. 3:10-15, since the specialized meaning of divine "commissioning" in the appointment of a prophet or deliverer is attested only in Jgs. 6:14.[12]

All the other occurrences of *šlḥ* in the call schema can be translated simply by "send" (as a messenger or for a particular purpose); it is not necessary to assume ipso facto behind the use of the root *šlḥ* a formulaic metaphor expressing God's general and absolute commissioning of a prophet or deliverer. The theory of a fixed prophetic call schema that originated in the northern kingdom ca. 800 B.C.E. and was adopted by written prophecy cannot claim as evidence the use of a formulaic "commissioning term" in these documents.[13]

The same is true for Ex. 3: only in one instance (v. 12) are we presented with the choice between stylistic ellipsis dependent on the immediate context or a specialized meaning ("commission") expressed by omission of the goal or purpose. Literary dissection of Ex. 3:10-15 that would bracket all occurrences of *šlḥ* because the specialized religious meaning of the root is out of place in this text, which is generally assigned to E,[14] is therefore unnecessary. Neither do these occurrences support a general and absolute commissioning.[15] Fischer is correct in observing that the occurrences of *šlḥ* (vv. 10,12-15) and *hālaḵ* ("go"; vv. 10-11), *yṣ'* hiphil ("bring out"; vv. 11-12) and *bô'* ("go in"; v. 13) constitute a semantic field characterized by the alternation between "send" and "bring out," but not by recourse to a preconceived commissioning terminology.[16] This semantic field reappears in Jer. 1:7.

The situation is different in Jgs. 6:14; Isa. 6:8; Hag. 1:12; Zec. 2:13, where the statement of goal or purpose is omitted and cannot be supplied; the root simply appears unheralded. Here this construction of *šlḥ* reclaims a known, assumed concept of commissioning, and we are dealing with the restricted, specialized meaning "commission." Posthumously, as it were, Ps. 105:26 claims the authority of this divine "commissioning" for Moses.

2. *History.* The root *šlḥ* appears 847 times in the OT; 564 of its occurrences are in the qal, 267 in the piel. The remaining 16 occurrences are divided among the pual (10), the hiphil (5), and the niphal (1). Since an etymological derivation from Akk. *šalû(m),* "throw, hurl," is as fruitless as attempts to associate the root with Arab. *saraḥa* II, "send" ("send cattle out to graze," "send a woman away" in the sense of "dismiss from marriage"),[17] *šlḥ* must be considered a word unique to Northwest Semitic.

11. See III.3 below.
12. See I.3 and III.3 below.
13. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 124-25; Richter, 157-58.
14. Weimar, 369-70.
15. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 125.
16. Pp. 72-76.
17. *HAL,* II, 1511-12.

The word *šuluḫtu,* "sending," in the Amarna letters[18] is probably a Canaanite loan-word based on a separate root.[19]

On the other hand, *šlḥ,* "send," is well attested in the Northwest Semitic domain, in Ugaritic[20] as well as in Phoenician, Hebrew, and Aramaic inscriptions.[21] The impv. *š^{e}laḥ* is notably frequent at Tell Arad.[22]

For literary Hebrew, *šlḥ* virtually monopolizes the huge semantic field of "sending," since the root **l'k* is represented in the OT only by the derivatives *ml'k, ml'kh,* and *ml'kwt.*[23]

In the OT, therefore, we need to reckon with not only a variety of everyday usages but also a whole series of specialized meanings together with metaphorical, encoded, and formulaic usage. From the 8th century on,[24] for example, in certain occurrences we can identify a specialized construction, omitting the indirect object, the statement of goal or purpose, which uses *šlḥ* in the specialized sense of "sending of prophets/deliverers by God." In its general and absolute import, this construction differs from similar formulations which, like Ex. 3:10 (*l^{e}ḵâ w^e'ešlāḥ^{a}ḵā 'el-par'ōh,* "go, I send you to Pharaoh"), display an analogous usage for a telic "sending of messengers" by God, or, like Ex. 3:16 (*lēḵ w^e'āsaptā . . . w^e'āmartā '^{a}lēhem,* "go and assemble . . . and say to them") express a simple charge.

Starting in the Persian period (ca. 500 B.C.E.), Imperial Aramaic replaced Hebrew as the official administrative language. The semantic field covered in Hebrew by *šlḥ* is represented equally in Aramaic by the roots *š^{e}laḥ* and *š^{e}ḏar.* Interestingly, Biblical Aramaic totally eschews Aram. *š^{e}ḏar,* whereas the later Aramaic of the Midrashim and Targums uses both roots equally; alongside the more common *š^{e}ḏar,* Syriac still uses *š^{e}laḥ.*

The LXX translates *šālîaḥ* with *apóstolos;*[25] only rarely, however, does the mishnaic tradition see in *šālîaḥ* a mediator of divine power, namely Moses.[26] Heb. 3:1 calls Jesus Christ *apóstolos,* with a clear reference to Moses in 3:2.

In the Syriac translation of the NT, *š^{e}laḥ* has already become a specialized religious term denoting the "sending" of Christ (Luke 1:26-28; 4:18) or the apostles (Acts 13:4) (cf. Syr. *š^{e}līḥā,* "apostle"); other types of "sending" are represented by Syr. *š^{e}ḏar.*

The extent to which divine sending, expressed by Syr. *š^{e}laḥ,* has become associated exclusively with the Christian message is shown by Luke 4:18, where Jesus' claim to having been sent by God is represented by *š^{e}laḥ.* The Syriac version of Isa. 61:1, the text being cited, uses a form of *š^{e}ḏar.*

---

18. EA 265:8.

19. *HAL,* II, 1511.

20. *UT,* no. 2419; *WUS,* no. 2610; *CML*², 158.

21. *KAI,* III, 24; *TSSI,* I, 38, 41, 43, 45; *DISO,* 300-302.

22. As noted by *HAL,* II, 1511: 5:2,[11]; 6:2; 7:[9]; 13:4; 14:3; see D. Pardee, *UF* 10 (1978) 303-5, 309-11.

23. → VIII, 308-9.

24. See III.3 below.

25. See VIII.1 below.

26. See, e.g., S. Schechter, ed., *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (Vindobonai, 1887), A1, l. 24; cf. Bernard, 410-13.

3. *Theological Interest.* The theological interest in the root *šlḥ* was long dominated by the LXX use of *apostéllein* to represent the commonest meaning, "send (someone)." According to Rengstorf,[27] there was scholarly consensus[28] that the early Christian term *apóstolos* was not based in any way on the verbal noun *šālîaḥ* (cf. Syr. *šᵉlîḥā* and Arab. *salīḥ,* "apostle") derived from the root *šlḥ* and used by rabbinic literature to denote a general power of attorney in civil matters.[29] It would be wrong, in this view, to trace the understanding of the apostolate to a specialized religious meaning of the roots *šlḥ/ apostéllein* in the OT. With respect to *apostéllein,* "We may thus say that in the LXX the word is as little given a specifically religious flavour as שלח in the Heb. OT. Even in the accounts of the sending of the prophets [Isa. 6:8; Jer. 1:7; Ezk. 2:3; cf. Hag. 1:12; Zec. 2:15[11]; 4:9; Mal. 3:23[4:4]; Ex. 3:10; Jgs. 6:8,14] we do not have a purely religious use."[30] The "sending" of prophets by God is thus to be understood as being entirely analogous to the "sending" of everyday messengers by human principals. There is no need to see behind the roots *šlḥ/apostéllein* the formulaic metaphor of an established prophetic commissioning.

These views of Rengstorf have not gone unchallenged. For example, Bernard cites several passages in Aramaic Midrashim and Targums that bestow the title of God's *šālîaḥ* exclusively on Moses and Elijah.[31] Naturally this usage does not refer to a general power of attorney exercised by the *šālîaḥ* of a person[32] but describes a mediator between God and God's people.[33] With this as a starting point, Bernard traces links to the designation of Christ as *apóstolos* in Heb. 3:1 and to the participation of the apostles in the *šᵉlîḥûṯ* of Christ.[34] Grässer, however, opposes such a specialized religious meaning, which would understand the person of the divine *šālîaḥ* on the basis of the notion of participation in and transmission of divine power; he translates Heb. 1:3 simply as referring to God's "messenger" on earth.[35] Thus it is still an open question whether a specialized religious meaning of *šlḥ/apostéllein* is present in the language of the late literature of the NT.

It is also disputed whether there is a specialized religious meaning of *šālaḥ* qal in the literature of the OT, either in the sense of participation in and transmission of divine power,[36] or in the sense of a divine "commissioning" of prophets, a specialized meaning that goes beyond the analogous usage.

On the one hand, Delcor and Jenni[37] still quote Rengstorf's words with approval; and Meyer[38] declares: "There is no such thing as a uniform use of שלח for the commis-

27. P. 418.
28. Von Campenhausen, 97-104.
29. Mish. *Ber.* 5:5.
30. Rengstorf, 401-2.
31. Pp. 410-13.
32. Mish. *Ber.* 5:5; see above.
33. Bernard, 413.
34. Ibid., 417-19.
35. Pp. 296-97.
36. See above.
37. P. 1334.
38. P. 56.

sioning of a prophet, formally distinct from other uses." For other exegetes, however, in the OT *šlḥ* is "the primary catchword for the commissioning of a prophet."[39] "Often an expression suggesting divine instructions (as in 2 S. 12:1 and the incorporation of Ex. 3:10 into 3:12-15; also 7:16), the verb שלח, 'send,' later plays a decisive role in the conflict between true and false prophecy (Jer. 14:14-15; cf. Delcor and Jenni [*TLOT,* III, 1333]). Occasionally it appears to take on a virtually general, absolute meaning (Ex. 3:12; 4:13; Jgs. 6:14; Isa. 6:8)."[40]

The reason for these differences of opinion is that there has so far been no successful, convincing identification of formal criteria for a possible specialized religious meaning of the root *šlḥ*. Even Richter notes that "it is not quite certain" that the use of *šlḥ* in the context of prophetic call narratives should be classified as a formula. "Its usage is nevertheless clear. It is limited to prophetic books and literature concerning prophets, as well as to texts that classify persons and activities as prophetic. It therefore belongs to the language of prophecy."[41]

The question of an analogous or "virtually general, absolute"[42] usage referring to sending by God is important for the exegesis of Ex. 3:1-22 as well as for discussion of the so-called quadripartite prophetic call schema: commission, objection, repudiation of the objection, and sign.[43] Schmidt isolates such schemata in Ex. 3:10-12; Jgs. 6:14-16,17-20; 1 S. 9–10; and Jer. 1:5-9, but admits that a perfectly coincident structure of the sequences, such as a fixed schema would require, cannot be identified.[44] All the more important is the search for set or formulaic vocabulary within these units, in order effectively to support the hypothesis by this additional argument.

Now *šlḥ* does in fact appear frequently in the first part of the schema, the commission (Ex. 3:10; Jgs. 6:14; 1 S. 9:16).[45] The verb appears twice in the third part of the schema, the repudiation of the objection, as a reinforcing confirmation of the commission (Ex. 3:12; Jer. 1:7). Especially in the first part of the schema, the commission, if the use of *šlḥ* can be shown to be formulaic (which would then hold true for other prominent instances of similar construction[46]), then the combination of two arguments, each insufficient by itself, becomes a kind of circumstantial evidence supporting the schema as a whole.

In assigning Ex. 3:10-14 in particular to the Elohistic section of the text, Schmidt posits the existence of a set call schema for deliverers and prophets in the northern kingdom as early as 850 B.C.E. (assigning of Ex. 3:10-12 to E, together with an early dating of Jgs. 6 and 1 S. 9–10), which was consciously adopted by written prophecy (Isa. 6:8; Jer. 1:7; Ezk. 2:3).[47] Conversely, the presence of a set schema in Ex. 3:10-12

---

39. S. Herrmann, *Jeremia 1,1–19. BK* XII/1 (1986), 64.
40. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 125.
41. P. 158.
42. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 125.
43. E.g., ibid., 123-27.
44. Ibid., 124.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., 125; Richter, 156-58.
47. Pp. 121-35.

is solid evidence for the literary unity of the text. The same conclusion holds true if *šlḥ*, used formulaically, is understood as a catchword of the literary unit Ex. 3:10-15 (it occurs in vv. 3,10,12,13,14,15).[48]

It is precisely this formulaic usage of *šlḥ* in Ex. 3:10-15, however, that Weimar considers possible only in a later period, arguing against the literary unity of the text.[49] Without substantiation,[50] he replaces *lᵉḵâ* with *lēḵ* in v. 10 and then brackets *ʾešlāḥᵃḵā* out of the original text, assigning it to a late redaction (JE). All the other analogous occurrences of *šlḥ* in Ex. 3:10-15 come under the verdict "no earlier than JE" (v. 13) or even R^P (vv. 12,14,15).[51]

II. "Extend."

1. *Hand.* Unlike *šlḥ* in the sense of "send," the expression *šālaḥ yāḏ* is not theologically charged. Of particular importance for understanding the expression is the establishment of a semantic framework within which it can be distinguished from the similar expression *nāṭâ yāḏ*.

Keel finds the distinction between the two expressions in the following observation: "The 'sending' of a hand (שלח יד) is always for a particular purpose, a concrete action; it is always functional. When the act of extending a hand serves simply as a gesture, we find נטה יד."[52] In other words, *nṭh yd* — as in the common expression *yāḏ nᵉṭûyâ* — can be understood as a divine or human gesture that conveys a threat or commands attention, even without explicit mention of the person to whom it is addressed. By contrast, *šlḥ yd* always denotes a singular, telic act of "grasping" a person or thing. It is essential, therefore, that "שלח יד is always *part* of an action, and that the subject of שלח יד and the subject of the action for which the hand was 'sent' are the same, whereas in the case of נטה יד one figure (e.g., the king of Babylon: Ezk. 30:25) may stretch out his hand and another (e.g., Yahweh: Ezk. 30:26) do something."[53]

Therefore if the expression *šālaḥ yāḏ* is to be meaningful, the concrete purpose of "extending one's hand" must be communicated textually or contextually; omission of the person addressed or the statement of purpose makes the expression incomplete or even incomprehensible.

If we try to transpose Keel's observations into a semantic framework for the expression *šālaḥ yāḏ* — whether we choose as our basis Greimas's actant model[54] or valency grammar and syntagm structure[55] — *šlḥ* proves to be trivalent, in contrast to *nṭh*, which was originally bivalent. Besides the subject (first actant) and direct object (second

48. Blum, 23; Fischer, 75.
49. Pp. 159-83.
50. Ibid., 159 n. 53.
51. Pp. 369-70, contra Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6*, 121-35, who leaves vv. 12-14 assigned to E.
52. Keel, 154.
53. Ibid., 156.
54. A.-J. Greimas, *Structural Semantics* (Eng. tr. Lincoln, 1983), esp. 202-5; cf. H. Schweizer, *Metaphorische Grammatik. ATS* 15 (1981) 126, 140.
55. W. Richter, *Grundlagen der althebräischen Grammatik, III: Der Satz. ATS* 13 (1980) 6.

actant; here realized exclusively by the Hebrew equivalents of "hand"), there is an obligatory third actant, an indirect object stating the goal or purpose. If all three pieces of information are realized in the clause, understanding the expression on the basis of the text itself poses no problems for the reader. If one element is missing, the communication process suffers "interference" at that point. The pragmatics of the text must then help determine whether we are dealing with linguistic carelessness on the part of the author or a deliberate stylistic device. There is also the possibility that the contemporary reader could draw on extratextual reality to supply the missing information. The association of a particular form with a highly specific *Sitz im Leben* may make it comprehensible even when otherwise constitutive actants are missing. Conversely, the absence of just these constitutive actants may point to a specialized meaning. Recognition of such omitted actants therefore provides a possible way for linguistics to make idiomatic and formulaic usage visible.

Since the number of occurrences of the expression *šālaḥ yāḏ* is relatively limited, for demonstration purposes we shall list all the possibilities for the realization or omission of actants, describing their significance for the fundamental semantic framework of the root.

The subject is always a natural, individual person: God (Ex. 3:20; 9:15; 24:11; Ezk. 8:3; Ps. 138:7) or a human being.

As direct object, we find *yāḏ, yāmîn* ("right hand," Gen. 48:14), and *śᵉmōʾl* ("left hand," Jgs. 3:21). A reflexive suffix referring to the subject is often added. There are occasional ellipses: 2 S. 6:6; Ob. 13. Ps. 18:17(16)//2 S. 22:17 and Ps. 57:4(3) are discussed below.

The indirect object may be realized in several ways: (a) *ʾel* + object, personal (Gen. 22:12; Ex. 24:11; 2 S. 18:12; Ezk. 2:9) or impersonal (2 S. 6:6); the meaning is "extend one's hand toward someone or something" (with friendly or hostile intent). (b) *ʿal* + object, personal or impersonal (1 K. 13:4; 1 Ch. 13:10); the meaning is the same as (a). (c) *bᵉ* + impersonal object (Ex. 22:7,10[8,11]; Ob. 13; Ps. 125:3; Job 28:9; Est. 9:10,15,16; Dnl. 11:42); the meaning is "lay one's hand on something" = "take something wrongfully." (d) *bᵉ* + personal object (Gen. 37:22; 1 S. 22:17; 24:7,11[6,10]; 26:9,11,23; Ps. 55:21[20]; Est. 2:21; 6:2; 8:7; 9:2); the meaning is "lay hands on someone" = "kill someone" (Neh. 13:2 only: "arrest someone"). (e) *lᵉ* + infinitive construct of a verb meaning "strike" or "seize" (*ʾḥz,* 1 Ch. 13:9; *pgʿ,* 1 S. 22:17; *šḥt,* 2 S. 1:14; 24:16 [here with the addition of the city name *yᵉrûšālayim*[56]]); the meaning is "extend one's hand to do something."

As Keel rightly notes, the relationship of *šlḥ yd* to the following verb is purely functional;[57] but this observation does not automatically mean that the root is emptied of semantic content.

Instances of omission of the direct object are regularly ellipses (2 S. 6:6; Ob. 13) and do not change the meaning.

---

56. Keel, 154.
57. Ibid.

When the statement of purpose of goal is omitted, we generally find as a substitute a following clause beginning with a *waw* consecutive or *waw* copulative and a finite form (with the same subject) of a verb meaning "strike," "seize," or "move in a particular direction" (*lqḥ,* "take": Gen. 3:22; 8:9; 22:10; Jgs. 3:21; 15:15; 2 K. 6:7; Ezk. 8:3; *šîṯ,* "lay": Gen. 48:14; *nkh* hiphil, "slay": Ex. 3:20; 9:15 [qal]; *'ḥz,* "grasp": Ex. 4:4 [bis]; *ḥzq* hiphil, "seize": Dt. 25:11; 2 S. 15:5; *ng',* "touch": Jer. 1:9; Job 1:11; 2:5; *bô'* hiphil, "bring in": Gen. 8:9; 19:10; *hmm* piel and *pîṣ,* "scatter": 2 S. 22:15//Ps. 18:15[14]; Ps. 144:6). The verb *yš',* "help," in Ps. 57:4(3) and 138:7 is discussed below.

In all these texts, Keel assumes an ellipsis of "לפגע . . . לשחת . . . or the like."[58] But the concept of substituted actants has several advantages: (1) The substituents constitute a formally and semantically coherent group. (2) The semantic trivalency found to be constitutive for the expression *šālaḥ yāḏ* can be identified in the text itself. (3) The few texts that simply omit the statement of purpose or goal without the substitution described display truly singular usage, possibly idiomatic, that remains to be explained;[59] they can thus be isolated on the basis of a verifiable linguistic criterion. (4) No more than when the statement of purpose is realized by *lipgōa'* or the like is it necessary to assume that the root *šlḥ* is emptied of semantic content.

The only exception to this construction is found in Ps. 138:7: *tišlaḥ yāḏeḵā wᵉṯôšî'ēnî yᵉmîneḵā,* "you stretch out your hand and your right hand delivers me," where the second clause realizes a change of subject, if only grammatical.[60] But this anomaly we may let pass as a case of poetic license, since God's hand and God's right hand (text) denote the same logical subject. Furthermore, the combination of these two predicates *(šlḥ/yš')* also appears in 57:4(3) *(yišlaḥ miššāmayim wᵉyôšî'ēnî).* This latter example, however, is hard to categorize: is it an ellipsis of *yāḏ* ("he extends [his hand] from heaven and helps me") or is it analogous to such texts as Gen. 20:2[61] ("from heaven he uses all means at his disposal to help me")? A similar problem appears in Ps. 18:17(16) = 2 S. 22:17 *(yišlaḥ mimmārôm yiqqāḥēnî),* where the second clause is attached without *waw.* If the absence of the *waw* is not treated as another example of poetic license, then in this isolated case (as in Cant. 5:4: *dôḏî šālaḥ yāḏô min-haḥōr,* "my beloved thrust his hand through the opening" — to grasp the bolt from within) the third actant must be supplied in the form "לפגע . . . לשחת . . . or the like."[62]

A final difficulty is presented by 1 K. 13:4: *wayyišlaḥ yāroḇ'ām 'eṯ-yāḏô mē'al hammizbēaḥ lē'mōr,* "and Jeroboam stretched out his hand from the altar and said"; the text seems to describe a self-sufficient minatory gesture. But v. 1 shows that the source of Jeroboam's vexation is well within his "reach," and v. 4b repeats *šālaḥ yāḏ* with its full trivalent construction. Therefore v. 4a should be treated as an ellipsis (of *'ālāyw,* "against him").

---

58. Ibid.; similarly *HAL,* II, 1512-13.
59. See below.
60. Keel, 156.
61. See IV.4 below.
62. Keel, 154.

2. *Other Objects.* A similar observation may be made about the extending *(šlḥ)* of a staff (*maṭṭeh,* 1 S. 14:27; *miš'ēnâ,* Jgs. 6:21) and the relationship of these passages to Ex. 9:23 and 10:13, where the extending of a staff is formulated with *nṭh.* In the latter, *nṭh* may be considered a self-sufficient gesture (with a change of subject in the second clause, which states the intended action[63]). In 1 S. 24:27 and Jgs. 6:21 *(šlḥ),* by contrast, the statement of purpose is replaced by two verbs of grasping or touching (*ṭbl,* "dip," and *ng'* piel, both continuing with the same subject[64]); the "tip of the staff" *(qᵉṣēh hammaṭṭeh)* is named precisely as the instrument used.

In Ps. 110:2, *maṭṭēh-'uzzᵉkā yišlaḥ yhwh miṣṣîyôn,* "may Yahweh extend from Zion the staff of your might," the statement of purpose is replaced by an asyndetically appended imperative (*rᵉḏēh,* "rule"). The change of subject from Yahweh, who "extends" (v. 2a), to the king, who rules (v. 2b), is already implicit in the formulation "your might" in v. 2a. Iconographically, this passage recalls depictions of the king with his tutelary deity standing behind him and "lending a hand."[65]

The distinction between *nāṭâ ḥereḇ* (Ezk. 30:25) and *šālaḥ ḥereḇ* (Jer. 25:16,27) works along these familiar lines; the latter refers to a concrete blow. Only here does the statement of purpose use the prep. *bên.*

In Ezk. 8:17 *wᵉhinnām šōlᵉḥîm 'eṯ-hazzᵉmôrâ 'el-'appî* ("they are sending the stench up my nose") is an extreme metaphor describing the abomination of alien cults in the temple (v. 16).

Twice the statement of purpose is omitted without substitution. In Joel 4:13(3:13) the direct object establishes a firm *Sitz im Leben* (harvest) for the expression *šilᵉḥû maggāl* ("send the sickle"). The purpose need not be stated because it is obvious. In Isa. 58:9 the same is true for *šᵉlaḥ 'eṣba'* ("pointing the finger" as an insulting gesture;[66] cf. Akk. *ubāna tarāṣu*[67]). In both cases we are dealing with stereotyped expressions.

In sum, we can characterize the fundamental semantic framework of *šālaḥ yāḏ* as follows: "set a hand in motion toward a 'goal' (topological or operant)." The expression appears to be used analogously of both God and human beings. It suggests stereotyped usage only where the constitutive statement of goal or purpose is omitted without substitution, in which case the function of the statement is replaced by an extratextual *Sitz im Leben,* and the expression can be understood only in the sense of a code. No specialized meaning is involved.

III. "Send."

1. *Three Actants.* Because there are so many occurrences of *šlḥ* with its primary meaning "send," the particularities of its construction cannot be listed in detail. Used in

---

63. Ibid.

64. See above.

65. O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. tr. 1978, repr. Winona Lake, ²1997), 264-65.

66. *HAL,* I, 81.

67. *AHw,* III, 1326; cf. *HAL,* II, 1512.

this sense, *šlḥ* is also trivalent: a subject (divine or human) "sends" a direct object (personal or impersonal) for a purpose or goal. Identification of the addressee still remains imperative.

Thus the basic semantic meaning is: "set someone or something in motion toward a goal (topological or operant)." The following examples remain within the bounds of what has been shown above under *šlḥ yd* and present no problems of semantic construction. Since they cover the overwhelming majority of the occurrences of *šlḥ* with the primary meaning "send," we shall begin by assuming that the actant model developed in the context of *šlḥ yd* can be transferred to the primary meaning of *šlḥ*, "send." The major difference is that in the examples already discussed the direct object remained in bodily contact with the subject throughout the entire action, whereas now it moves free of the subject.[68]

The most important ways in which the actants can be realized with the primary meaning *šlḥ*, "send," are the following:

The subjects doing the sending may be either divine or human, but are almost always natural individual persons (rarely a group as in Jer. 39:14; cf. Zec. 7:2, where *bêṯ-'ēl* stands for the priests resident there; cf. also 2 K. 10:5).

The direct objects can be natural persons, usually individuals but occasionally groups (Nu. 22:15; Dt. 9:23), or concrete, tangible objects of the natural world (*geḏî hā'izzîm*, "kid," Gen. 38:20,23); only exceptionally is the object abstract (*ḥeseḏ we'emeṯ*, "steadfast love and faithfulness," Ps. 57:4[3]; *dāḇār*, "a word," Isa. 9:7[8]).

God's "sending" is usually treated analogously to human sending. God, too, sends objects, individually or in groups (*ḥiṣṣîm*, 2 S. 22:15), as well as persons, singular and plural (Dt. 9:23). Only God sends *ḥeseḏ we'emeṯ* (Ps. 57:4[3]) and *dāḇār* (Isa. 9:7[8]).

a. The statement of purpose or goal (third actant) can be introduced by various prepositional constructions. The addressee or the topological goal of the action can be specified not only be *'el* (the most common construction when distance is involved, e.g., Ex. 3:10,13-15), *he locale* (2 K. 2:6), or the name of a city alone (Ai, Josh. 7:2; Jericho, 2 K. 2:4), but also, without any difference in meaning (cf. esp. 2 K. 2:2,4,6), by *le* (Nu. 31:4,6); Jer. 16:16 [bis]; Ezk. 23:40), *be* (Jer. 49:14; Lam. 1:13), *'aḏ* (2 K. 2:2), or *'al* (Jer. 1:7; 29:31; Job 5:10; Neh. 6:3). There are also instances of the same construction that have the connotation of a traditional "ethical dative" (*le*, Gen 45:23; Isa. 19:20; *lammāyim*, "for water," Jer. 14:3) or an instrumental (*šālaḥ beyaḏ*, "send by the hand of . . . ," Prov. 26:6; Est. 8:10).

In contrast to the usage of *šlḥ yd*, when *šlḥ* is used with its primary meaning "send," third actants realized by prepositional phrases may describe the goal of the action as movement toward or away from a place or person (referentially). To or from a place: with *min* (Gen. 37:14; Nu. 13:3; Dt. 9:23; Josh. 2:1 ["send scouts from a place"]), with *be* (Ex. 9:19, *baśśāḏeh*, "in the open field"; 1 S. 15:18,20, *badderek*, "on the way"; 1 K. 9:27, *bā'onî*, "aboard the ship"). To or from a person: with *lipnê* (Gen. 24:7; 45:5,7; Ex.

---

68. Delcor and Jenni, 1331.

23:20,28; 33:2; Mic. 6:4; Ps. 105:17) or *millipnê* (2 K. 6:32, "from his presence"), with *liqra'ṯ,* "to meet" (1 S. 25:32; 2 S. 10:5), also with *'im* (Ex. 33:12; Neh. 2:9) or *'ēṯ* (Gen. 24:40; 43:8; 2 S. 13:27).

Since there are some 500 occurrences of the primary meaning, it is not surprising that it is impossible to assign each of the many different constructions to a particular sphere of usage.

b. To specify purpose, the third actant is often realized by *l*ᵉ plus an infinitive construct. As in the case of *šālaḥ yāḏ,* the verbs tend to those signifying grasping (*lqḥ,* "take," Jer. 36:21; *nkh* hiphil, "take someone's life," Jer. 40:14) intensive communication (*r'h,* "see," Nu. 32:8; *ḥlh* piel, "entreat," Zec. 7:2; *nb'* niphal, "prophesy," Jer. 26:12; with God as subj.: *'śh,* "do," Nu. 16:28 [and v. 29 with ellipsis]; Dt. 34:11; also *drš,* "inquire," 2 K. 1:6; 22:18; *dbr* piel, "speak with conviction," 2 K. 18:27; *ḥrp* piel, "mock," 2 K. 19:4,16), or motion (*tûr,* "explore," Nu. 13:16,17; 14:36; *rgl* piel, "spy out," Josh. 6:25; 14:7; with God as subj.: *bśr* piel, "bring a message," Isa. 61:1; *hlk* hithpael, "patrol," Zec. 1:10).

In Nu. 13:27; Isa. 55:11; and Jer. 28:9, this construction is replaced by a relative clause introduced by *'ᵃšer.*

c. Again as in the case of *šālaḥ yāḏ,* the statement of purpose or goal can be substituted by a *waw* consecutive or *waw* copulative introducing a verb of grasping or bodily movement at the beginning of the next clause. In such cases there is usually a change of subject, so that the persons sent become the subject of the subsequent action (*hlk,* Gen. 28:5; Josh. 8:9; *hlk* hithpael, Josh. 18:4; *tûr,* Nu. 13:2 [v. 3 with ellipsis]; *qûm,* Josh. 18:4; *'lh,* 2 K. 1:13; *šḥt* hiphil, 2 S. 11:1; *lqḥ,* Gen. 42:16; Ex. 2:5;[69] *dbr* piel, 2 K. 1:6; *ngd* hiphil, 1 K. 20:17; *lḥm* niphal, Isa. 20:1). Without change of subject: 1 S. 26:4.

When God is the subject, both possibilities are open: an act of sending such that those sent become the subject of the subsequent action (change of subject; *yṣ'* hiphil, Nu. 20:16; 1 S. 12:8; *pnh* piel, Mal. 3:1; *ḥlh:* Ezk. 13:6) or an act of sending such that the subsequent action is carried out by God the sender (without change of subject; *ngp,* Josh. 24:5; *nṣl* hiphil, 1 S. 12:11). Comparison of Josh. 24:5 with 1 S. 12:8,11 rules out identification of a semantic difference by this criterion alone.

2. *Second Actant Omitted.* Already in the fully realized normal trivalent construction of *šlḥ* there are many instances with the meaning "send a message or messengers": *šālaḥ mal'āḵîm* (e.g., Gen. 32:4; when God is the subject, usually the sg. *mal'āḵ,* e.g., Nu. 20:16) or *šālaḥ ṣîrîm* (Jer. 49:14), *šālaḥ dᵉḇārîm* (e.g., Prov. 26:6, etc.; with God as subj.: Isa. 9:7[8]; Zec. 7:12) or *šālaḥ sᵉpārîm* (e.g., Est. 8:10). Only a single text substitutes the direct object explicitly from the consecutive clause (2 K. 1:2: *wayyišlaḥ mal'āḵîm wayyō'mer 'ᵃlēhem,* "and he sent messengers and said to them, 'Go'"). The various individual formulations all have the same meaning.[70]

Emphasis on the person of the messenger can be signaled by *bᵉyaḏ* (2 S. 10:2; Zec.

69. See Stähli.
70. → VIII, 308-25.

7:12; Prov. 26:6; Est. 8:10) or by a double object (person and thing) (*kōl ʾᵃšer-šᵉlāḥanî ʾᵃlêḵem,* "all that he sent me to tell you," Jer. 42:21; cf. 42:5; 43:1]).

Unique to *šlḥ* in the sense of "send a message or messengers" is a very common construction in which the direct object is omitted without substitution. Here the "sending" *(šlḥ)* of a message or messengers is understood as a process of communication taking place exclusively between the subject and the addressee; both the person of the messenger and the content of the message are ignored. In the light of the basic semantic meaning of *šlḥ,*[71] these constructions serve to signal a goal- or result-oriented contact. There is no apparent difference in meaning between constructions with God as subject and those that assign this role to a human individual.

Thus we have the following construction model, in which the statement of purpose or goal may be realized in a wide variety of ways: The subject may be God (Jer. 16:16; 23:38) or a human being (Gen. 38:25; Nu. 22:10,37; Jer. 2:10; Hos. 5:13; etc.); the direct object is omitted without substitution, and the indirect object is introduced by (a) *ʾel* (Gen. 38:25; Nu. 22:10; 1 K. 20:10; Ezk. 23:40; with God as subj.: e.g., Jer. 23:38), (b) *lᵉ* (Ezk. 23:40; with God as subj.: Jer. 16:16), (c) *ʿal* (Jer. 29:31), (d) *liqraʾṯ* (2 S. 10:5), (e) or *lᵉ* plus infinitive construct (*lᵉhaggîḏ,* Gen. 32:6; *liqrōʾ,* Nu. 16:12; *lᵉnaḥᵃmô,* 2 S. 10:2).

Ex. 9:7 (*wayyišlaḥ parʿōh wᵉhinnēh,* "and Pharaoh sent [. . .] and behold") is a genuine ellipsis of the indirect object without change of meaning. Similarly, the omission of the indirect object in Nu. 22:15 is a stylistic device to avoid repetition (*wayyōsep̱;* cf. vv. 5 and 10). In 1 K. 2:29; 2 K. 5:22; Jer. 43:2, the third actant can be reconstructed, although it is realized oddly *(lēʾmōr).* Finally, in Ex. 4:13 the construction *šᵉlaḥ-nāʾ bᵉyaḏ-tišlāḥ* may be translated "send (the message) through whomever you wish to send."[72]

3. *Third Actant Omitted.* To this point we have looked at a great variety of constructions and expressions in which *šlḥ* conveys the transmission of messages or the sending of messengers. This survey has brought out once more the constitutive role of the third actant but has provided no evidence for a specialized use of the term with God has subject, nor has it revealed a semantic distinction dependent on whether the direct object is realized or omitted. The different usages are analogous and random.

For Herrmann,[73] nevertheless, *šlḥ* is "the primary catchword in the OT for the prophetic commission, as may be seen, e.g., in Isa. 6:8. . . . In six passages God uses stereotyped diction, albeit adapted to the particular context, to say that he 'sent (or will send) his servants the prophets' (Jer. 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:15; 44:4); this formula is also used in 2 K. 17:13, a text recognized as Dtr. There can be no doubt that this terminology was shaped by the Deuteronomists or at least stands within that tradition. Behind it stands the somewhat didactic notion, influenced by Deuteronomy, that God

71. See III.1 above.
72. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 186.
73. Herrmann, *Jeremia 1,1–19,* 64.

sends his prophets to show the people the right way, in order that they may walk in his Torah (e.g., Jer. 26:4-5)."

Thus a specific usage of the root *šlḥ* is accorded a specialized meaning, not just definable but also associated with a particular theological school; this association logically identifies a firm *Sitz im Leben* for this meaning as well as a terminus a quo: Dtn/Dtr or later.

Although he dates this specialized meaning earlier,[74] Richter attempts to use linguistic tools to distinguish it from other usages of the root *šlḥ*, as follows: "The object of the verb is a person (personal suffix) [not a thing like *yāḏ;* cf. Gen. 3:22; 8:9; 19:10; 22:10; etc., or *dāḇār,* etc.; cf. 2 S. 24:13; 2 K. 5:5; no indirect object with prepositions such as *b;* cf. Job 28:9; Gen. 37:22]), who sometimes is sent, with *'l,* to another person or, with *l* + infinitive, to an action. The subject of the verb is Yahweh or Elohim [not a human person, as in Gen. 20:2 (Abimelech); 27:42 (Rebekah); 28:5 (Isaac); 31:4; 32:4(3) (Jacob), etc.] (in the mouth of a human speaker) or, as a substitute, 'I' (in the mouth of God). This definition does not identify an expression that is always formulated in the same way, but it does describe elements that lay a more secure foundation for further observations than a simple single term would do."[75]

The "restriction" of the third actant to realization with the prep. *'el* or *l*ᵉ plus an infinitive construct contributes little: on the one hand, the overwhelming majority of the six hundred or so occurrences of *šālaḥ* qal use this construction; on the other, several of the key occurrences of the prophetic commission are not formed in this way (e.g., Jer. 1:7 with *'al,* Isa. 6:8 with a totally absent third actant).

Thus we are left with no criterion beyond realization of the subject by Yahweh or Elohim and the direct object by a person (or pronominal suffix). Finally, therefore, even Richter concludes that wherever God uses the root *šlḥ* to "single out" human beings, the author or redactor of the text undertakes a conscious placement in the prophetic context.[76]

This theory must be challenged, for there are more exceptions than just the two "quite isolated" cases cited by Richter himself: "the sending of a deliverer in Jgs. 6:14, with its systematizing echo in the DtrH (1 S. 12:11)."[77] In 1 S. 25:32, e.g., David says that God "sent" *(šlḥ)* Abigail to him. In Isa. 48:16 it is open to discussion whether Deutero-Isaiah or the victorious Cyrus declares: *wᵉʿattâ ʾᵃḏōnāy yhwh šᵉlāḥanî wᵉrûḥô,* "and now my Lord Yahweh has sent me, (he) and his spirit." Jer. 43:10 is unambiguous: *hinᵉnî šōlēaḥ wᵉlāqaḥtî 'eṯ-nᵉḇûḵāḏre'ṣṣar,* "I am going to send and take Nebuchadnezzar"; Nebuchadnezzar is in fact the direct object of *lqḥ,* but logically must also be viewed as the object of God's sending. In Jer. 25:9 the same is true of *'eṯ-kol-mišpᵉḥôṯ ṣāpôn,* "all the tribes of the north." Finally, in Dt. 9:23, where Moses is speaking, God uses the root *šlḥ* expressly *(lē'mōr)* to commission the entire peo-

74. See I.3 above.
75. Pp. 156-57, with nn. 52 and 53.
76. Ibid., 157-58.
77. Ibid., 158.

ple. It is true that none of these passages constructs the third actant with *'el* or *l*ᵉ plus infinitive construct, but the same argument can be cited against Isa. 6:8 and Jer. 1:7.[78]

Richter's criteria are therefore insufficient for formal isolation of a specialized prophetic meaning; furthermore, there is clearly a divine "sending" of a person, expressed by the root *šlḥ,* that need not be placed in the prophetic context.[79]

On the other hand, a different formal criterion attracts attention: a series of texts strikingly omits without substitution the constitutive statement of purpose or goal, which, as has been shown, can never be eliminated without a particular reason. This group, of quite manageable size, comprises Jgs. 6:14; 13:8; 2 S. 24:13; Isa. 6:8 (bis); (42:19); 48:16; Jer. 14:14,15; 23:21,32; 27:15; 28:9,15; 29:9; Hag. 1:12; Zec. 2:13(9); Ps. 105:26; Neh. 6:12. Fundamentally, God is the only subject; the direct object is one or several natural persons (prophets and deliverers); the statement of purpose or goal is omitted without substitution. None of the passages uses the stylistic device of ellipsis, as does Nu. 16:29, for example, where the omission of the third actant can be explained as a way to avoid repeating v. 28, *yhwh šᵉlāḥanî laʿᵃśôṯ,* "Yahweh has sent me to do. . . ." Neither are there contextual reasons for omitting the third actant, as in Ex. 3:12.

Here we agree with Fischer that the occurrences of *šlḥ* in Ex. 3:10,12-15, together with *hlk* in vv. 20-21, *yṣ'* hiphil in vv. 11-12, and *bô'* in v. 13 form a semantic field characterized primarily by the alternation of "send" and "bring out," not by recourse to a preexisting understanding of sending as commissioning.[80] Fischer does speak of a semantic field of "sending," but interprets it in a nonspecific sense. Ex. 3:12 responds to Moses' concrete objection to being sent to Pharaoh (*'el-parʿōh,* vv. 10-11); v. 12 is to be read as an assurance of support in this difficult situation. Therefore the phrase *'el-parʿōh,* "to Pharaoh," from the preceding context (vv. 10-11) can be supplied as the third actant for the occurrence of *šlḥ* in v. 12.

In the group of *šlḥ* texts listed above, however, no semantic field is developed around the central concept of "sending." Instead, the root is placed in an explicitly prophetic context by mention in Jgs. 13:8 of the *'îš hā'ᵉlōhîm,* "man of God," and in 2 S. 24:13 by the term *nāḇî'* (v. 11b) and the "word event" formula (v. 12). In Isa. 6:8, in a call scene set in heaven, the prophet answers: *hinᵉnî šᵉlaḥēnî,* "Here I am, send me." In Jgs. 6:14, similarly, *šlḥ* immediately follows the endowment of the deliverer with divine "might" (performative usage: "Go in this might of yours") and the statement of his concrete task (v. 14b); it functions as a validation formula (*hᵃlō' šᵉlaḥtîḵā,* "Have I not sent you?").

Jeremiah employs this highly unusual construction of *šlḥ* to challenge the authority of his opponents, the "false prophets" (Jer. 27:15; 28:15; 29:9), and without any need to argue his case further. The later occurrences (Isa. 48:16; Hag. 1:12; Zec. 2:13; Neh. 6:12) also use this construction to establish the divine authority of their "sending."

---

78. See above.
79. See above.
80. Pp. 71-76.

The information conveyed by the omitted statement of purpose or goal can be understood only from a context explicitly characterized as prophetic, in which God declares in almost "general, absolute" terms:[81] "I have sent you." The passages cited require that this construction be treated as a technical term. This understanding presupposes a well-defined notion of the function and authority of someone "sent" by God. Ps. 105:26 claims this same authority for Moses. Here we see a significant difference between these passages and Ex. 3:10-15.

Interestingly, it is the "coming true" of the prophet's word that serves as the criterion determining whether a prophet actually possesses the authority of having been sent by God in the "general and absolute" sense (Jer. 28:9: *bᵉḇô' dᵉḇar hannāḇî' yiwwāḏa' hannāḇî' ᵓᵃšer šᵉlāḥô yhwh*). Here again this criterion implies the telic element (association with a concrete action) normally expressed by the third actant. This expectation that the word of someone sent *(šlḥ)* by God will come true shows that Isa. 42:19 — "Who is as blind as my servant and as deaf as my messenger whom I send?" — is a sarcastic perversion.

In response to Richter, we can state our conclusions more precisely: wherever a text speaks of God's "sending" *(šlḥ)* a person while omitting the third actant without substitution (unless the context makes a plausible case for stylistic ellipsis), we are dealing with formulaic language in the sense of well-defined specialized terminology for the sending of prophets.

For the exegesis of Ex. 3, it is important to note that only v. 12 allows even the possibility of a "sending" as "commissioning" in the sense described; even here, however, the omission of the third actant is explained by the structure of vv. 10-12. V. 10 uses *šlḥ* in the everyday sense of "send," in this case to Pharaoh. This usage is continued analogously in v. 11, in Moses' objection to going to Pharaoh; it appears once again in v. 12, where *šlḥ* is used in an abbreviated but not stereotyped construction (*'ānōḵî šᵉlaḥtîḵā* [viz. *'el-par'ōh*]). Therefore it is unnecessary to bracket the occurrences in vv. 10-12 on literary grounds,[82] but neither is it necessary to attach a "general, absolute"[83] meaning to the language used.

In Ex. 3:13-15 examples of the second sense of the semantic field of "sending"[84] do not continue the abbreviated usage of *šlḥ* in v. 12; here the construction is trivalent and begins with a new goal statement of the third actant (*ᵓᵃlēḵem*, "to you," i.e., to the people).

Vv. 10-12 associate the root *šlḥ* with being sent to Pharaoh, a meaning that can be found even in the abbreviated construction of v. 12. But now the reader's expectations are abruptly reversed. The term *šlḥ,* which the pragmatics of vv. 10-12 has connected with "being sent to Pharaoh," is redirected to mean "being sent to the people" (vv. 13-15). The result of this reversal is a degree of literary tension between the use of "send" in vv. 10-12 on the one hand and vv. 13-15 on the other, but no specialized meaning in the sense of a prophetic commissioning is present in vv. 10-12.

81. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 125.
82. Weimar, 369.
83. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 124-25.
84. Fischer, 72-76.

It is also noteworthy that the specialized meaning of *šlḥ* appears only once (Jgs. 6:14) in the first part of the prophetic call schema, the commission. In the commission sequences of the other examples of the schema cited by Schmidt,[85] *šlḥ* appears twice with its ordinary meaning (Ex. 3:10; 1 S. 9:16) and once does not appear at all (Jer. 1:5). In the third part of the schema, the repudiation of the objection, *šlḥ* appears twice, once in stereotyped usage (Ex. 3:12) and once in analogous usage (Jer. 1:7). In short, *šlḥ* with the specialized meaning of a technical term is not constitutive of the quadripartite call schema (e.g., 1 S. 9–10; Jer. 1). Neither is the specialized meaning of a prophetic commissioning limited to occurrences in this schema (e.g., Jgs. 13:8; Isa. 6:8; 42:19[86]). The specialized meaning does, however, develop in the context of prophetic commissioning, with the earliest examples being found in Isa. 6:8; Jgs. 6:14; and 2 S. 24:13. Without prejudice to the disputed dating of these texts, esp. Jgs. 6:14b, which Weimar[87] and Becker[88] assign to a later Dtr redaction, it is safe to assume a specialized meaning of *šlḥ* in the sense of prophetic commissioning as early as the 8th century.

There are only a few other isolated omissions of the third actant. For example, 2 S. 10:7, *wayyišlaḥ 'eṯ-yô'āḇ wᵉ'ēṯ kol-haṣṣāḇā',* when compared to 11:1, may be translated "have the army set out" (for *šlḥ* piel cf. 18:2).

The omission of the third actant in 2 K. 16:11 is likewise to be understood as a simple ellipsis to avoid repetition of material from v. 10, while 2 K. 2:16b,17 can probably be considered a deliberate stylistic device to imitate the "telegraphic style" of Elisha, who is very laconic throughout 2 K. 2; the reader has already learned what is at issue from v. 16a.

In 1 K. 12:18 the construction *wayyišlaḥ . . . rᵉḥaḇ'ām 'eṯ-'ᵃḏōnîrām* (emended), "Rehoboam sent Adoniram [where?]," is unusual, as is *kol-'ᵃšer šᵉlāḥô yô'āḇ,* "all that Joab had sent him," in 2 S. 11:22. There is no evidence of a specialized meaning, however; both passages are example of breviloquence.

The semantics and discrepant (bivalent) syntactic structure of a limited number of occurrences would lead the reader to expect a piel rather than a qal. In 2 S. 18:29, e.g., *lišlōaḥ 'eṯ-'eḇeḏ hammeleḵ* must be translated with "send away."

"In the case of 1 Ch. 8:8 . . . (מִן־שִׁלְחוֹ), it is debatable whether the strange form is meant to be a qal or piel infinitive, or whether the text is corrupt."[89] The usual translation, "dismiss/divorce a wife," presupposes the piel.

4. *Second and Third Actants Omitted.* Jer. 39:13 can be considered an anacolouthon, as the repetition of the root in v. 14 shows (see the discussion of Ex. 9:7 below). But there remain a whole series of constructions with *šlḥ* in which both the direct object (second actant) and statement of purpose or goal (third actant) are omitted, although the third actant is substituted in the usual way (addition of a clause with *waw* consecu-

85. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 124.
86. See above.
87. P. 174.
88. U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum. BZAW* 192 (1990), 145-51: DtrH.
89. *HP,* 195.

tive or *waw* copulative and a finite form of a verb of grasping or exertion, using the same subject). These fit the following structural model:

The subject (first actant) is God (Jer. 43:10) or one or more human beings (Jer. 39:14); the direct object (second actant) is omitted without substitution; the indirect object (third actant) is omitted and substituted by a *waw* consecutive or *waw* copulative with a finite verb form having the same subject. The verbs used are: *lqḥ*, "take" (Gen. 20:2; 27:45; Dt. 19:12; 2 S. 9:5; 1 K. 7:13; 2 K. 6:13; 11:4; 23:16; Jer. 25:9; 37:17; 38:14; 39:14; 43:10); *qr'*, "call" (Gen. 27:42; 31:4; 41:8,14; Ex. 9:27; 1 K. 2:36,42; 12:20); *bô'* hiphil, "bring in" (Est. 5:10); *'sp*, "collect" (2 S. 11:27; 2 Ch. 34:29); *yrd* hiphil, "have brought down" (1 K. 1:53); *yṣ'* hiphil, "bring out" (2 S. 10:16); *drš*, "inquire" (2 S. 11:3); and *śkr*, "hire" (2 S. 10:6). The context (good examples being Gen. 20:2 and Jer. 39:14) rules out a mere sending of messages or messengers, as is the case when only the second actant is omitted;[90] a concrete action is expected. Traditionally, such constructions have been rendered by giving a causative twist to the second predicate (e.g., Jer 39:14: "they had Jeremiah taken") or by using combinations like "sent away and brought."

It is proper to object that such a desemanticization, which limits the root *šlḥ* to the function of an auxiliary verb, should be posited only on persuasive evidence or if absolutely necessary. The second translation supplies an addressee, the third actant ("sent away"), by assuming a de facto ellipsis of *mal'āḵîm*, "messengers," for the direct object, the second actant, without any textual evidence (cf. Ex. 9:7, which involves a real ellipsis of *mal'āḵîm*).

A textually grounded possibility of understanding how the root *šlḥ* can retain its basic semantic meaning ("set someone or something in motion toward a goal, topological or operant") even when the second and third actants are omitted emerges from the observation that such constructions appear in situations of distress or great emotional agitation. Such a situation demands an immediate and decisive action, which is named in the verb that follows *šlḥ*. Here the function of *šlḥ* is clearly to indicate that the consequent action must be carried out at all costs. Therefore a translation such as "he/they used all the means at their disposal and brought . . ." is preferable.

The same probably holds true for the laconic imperative construction in 1 K. 18:19: *šᵉlaḥ qᵉḇōṣ 'ēlay 'eṯ-kol-yiśrā'ēl*, "set all the wheels in motion and assemble all Israel for me."

IV. Piel in Trivalent Constructions. Many of the approximately two hundred occurrences of the piel stay within the syntactic and semantic construction of the qal. These passages point either to a goal or to a second action yet to be carried out; there is no plausible semantic distinction from the qal, either in the sense of an "intensification" or an "iterative connotation." The constructions in question are trivalent, the indirect object being realized by various prepositional phrases (*'el*, Isa. 66:19; Jer. 27:3; *lᵉ*, Gen. 24:54; 1 S. 6:2; 30:26; *'al*, Jer. 17:8; *'aḏ*, Isa. 57:9; *lipnê*, Ex. 23:27; *bᵉ*, Dt. 28:48;

90. See IV.2 above.

Jgs. 19:29; 20:61), *he locale* (Gen. 28:6; Isa. 43:14), a toponym alone (*ʿeqrôn,* 1 S. 5:10), *l*ᵉ plus infinitive construct (Gen. 19:13), or by a substitution of the type described (Gen. 24:56; 37:32; Ex. 15:7, usually with a change of subject). Here we may also include passages that, as in the case of the qal, indicate the sending of messengers by omitting the direct object (Isa. 43:14) or by adding *b*ᵉ*yaḏ* (1 S. 11:7).

To these instances of *šlḥ* piel in trivalent construction, with the telic orientation familiar from the qal, we may add the many passages where the meaning is "let something loose upon someone or something."[91] The subject is always God; the indirect object is usually realized by *b*ᵉ plus suffix (only in Jer. 9:15[16] and 49:37 do we find the expression *šillaḥ ʾeṯ-haḥereḇ ʾaḥ*ᵃ*rê*). The direct object is "one of the many available instruments of punishment": fury (Ex. 15:7; Ezk. 7:3; Ps. 78:49; Job 20:23), terror (Ex. 23:27), pestilence (Lev. 26:25; Ezk. 14:19; 28:23; Am. 4:10; 2 Ch. 7:13), serpents (Nu. 21:6; Jer. 8:17), hornets (Dt. 7:20), a curse (Dt. 28:20; Mal. 2:2,4 [resolve to curse]), teeth of beasts (Dt. 32:24), lions (2 K. 17:25,26), roving bands (2 K. 24:2 [bis]), Assyria (Isa. 10:6), wasting disease (Isa. 10:16; Ps. 106:15 [text?]), the sword (Jer. 9:15[16]; 24:10; 29:17; 49:37), (arrows of) famine (Ezk. 5:16[bis],17), four punishments (Ezk. 14:21), fire (Ezk. 39:6; Hos. 8:14; Am. 1:4,7,10,12; 2:2,5), a great army (Joel 2:25), vermin (Ps. 78:45), man against man (Zec. 8:10).[92] The linkage of the indirect object may be realized (a) by *b*ᵉ plus suffix (Jer. 8:17; 24:10; Ezk. 7:3) or a noun naming a person (Isa. 10:6,16) or thing (in the expression *šillaḥ ʾēš b*ᵉ*,* "hurl fire": Hos. 8:14; Am. 1:4,7,10,12), or (b) by *ʾaḥ*ᵃ*rê* in the expression *šillaḥ ḥereb ʾaḥ*ᵃ*rê* ("send the sword after someone": Jer. 9:15[16]; 49:37).

V. Piel in Bivalent Constructions. Unique to the piel, by contrast, are constructions with *min.* Unlike *šālaḥ min* (Gen. 37:14; Nu. 13:3; Josh. 2:1) in the sense of "send out (scouts to investigate the land)," this frequent use of *šālaḥ min* is limited to designating spatial motion away from the subject of the action: "send someone or something away, dismiss"; the purpose and goal of the action are incidental (cf. Gen. 3:23[93]). In contrast to the use of the qal, the piel here does not point beyond itself but expresses its semantic meaning complete in itself; it denotes motion in respect to the subject (dynamic and referential) that achieves its own goal (resultative). The texts in question are the following:

The subject may be God (Gen. 3:23; 19:19; Lev. 18:24; 20:23) or a human being (Gen. 8:8,10; 25:6; 26:27; Ex. 11:1; 14:15; Nu. 5:2; Dt. 15:12-13,18); the direct object may be impersonal (Gen. 8:8,10) or personal (Gen. 3:23; 19:29; 25:6; 26:27; Ex. 11:1; 12:33); the indirect object may be introduced (a) by *min,* designating the location of the subject (Ex. 12:33: *min-hāʾāreṣ,* "from the land"; Nu. 5:3,4: *miḥûṣ lammaḥ*ᵃ*neh,* "outside the camp"; Dt. 24:1: *mibbêṯô,* "out of his house") or (b) by *mipp*ᵉ*nê* (Lev. 18:24; 20:23) or *mēʾēṯ* (Gen. 26:27).

91. *HP,* 196.
92. Ibid.
93. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 270.

In texts where the meaning is "send away, dismiss" (in either a hostile or amicable sense), the prep. *min* can be omitted entirely without loss of the separative connotation. The statement of the indirect object proves ultimately to be facultative; in cases where the piel can plausibly be claimed to convey a meaning different from that of the qal, *šlḥ* piel is regularly bivalent. The subject may be God (1 S. 20:22), human(s) (Gen. 12:20; 18:16; 32:27[26]; Dt. 22:7), or natural objects (Jer. 17:8; Ezk. 17:6-7; Ps. 80:12[11]); the direct object may be human(s) (Gen. 12:20; 21:14; pl.: Gen. 24:59), natural objects (Jer. 17:8; Ezk. 17:6-7), animals (Lev. 14:7,53; 16:10,22,26), inanimate objects or collectives (*bᵉʿîrōh,* "fire": Ex. 22:4[5]; *resen,* "bridle": Job 30:11; *leḥem,* "bread": Eccl. 11:1; *ḥᵃḇālîm,* "umbilical cords": Job 39:3), or abstracts (*rûaḥ:* Ps. 104:30).

In this separative usage the third actant, the topological goal of the "sending away," may be expressed facultatively by a prepositional phrase (*ʾel,* Lev. 14:53; Nu. 5:3-4; *ʿal,* Lev. 14:7; *bᵉ,* Lev. 16:22; *he locale,* Lev. 16:10,21). The presence of the third actant does not alter the meaning, but this construction is phenomenologically difficult to distinguish from the formally analogous trivalent constructions of *šlḥ* piel.[94]

Also facultative but quite common is a second clause with *waw* consecutive or *waw* copulative and a finite form of *hlk,* "go" (with change of subject) (Gen. 21:14; 26:31; 30:25; 45:24; Ex. 18:27; Josh. 2:21; 22:6; Jgs. 2:6; 1 S. 6:6,8; 2 S. 3:23-24; 1 K. 8:66; 11:21; with *yṣʾ:* Gen. 8:7; Jer. 15:1; with *str* niphal, "be concealed": 1 S. 20:5). This combination usually appears in the context of a friendly dismissal or leave-taking (the only exception being Jer. 3:1). But the same meaning can be conveyed without the addition of *hlk,* either by the bivalent construction without any addition (1 K. 11:22 vs. 11:21; 1 S. 9:26) or with a facultative identification of the place to which people are dismissed (Josh. 22:7 vs. 22:6), or by the addition of *bᵉšālôm,* "in peace" (Gen. 26:29), or the like (cf. Gen. 31:27).

This vacillation between bivalent and trivalent realizations, not atypical of the piel in general,[95] does not really ease the task of providing a tolerably succinct survey of the possible constructions of *šlḥ* piel and their assignment to specific semantic connotations. The linguistic evidence provides little help, for example, in describing the difference in meaning between Lev. 16:22 and Jgs. 19:29 in terms of morphosyntactic categories. The two constructions are phenomenologically equivalent (realization of the third actant with the prep. *bᵉ*); but Jgs. 19:29 expresses movement toward a goal in the same sense as the qal ("sent into the territory of . . ."), whereas Lev. 16:22 describes the "expulsion" of the scapegoat, for which the words "into the desert" are merely a facultative circumstantial qualifier. For the correct translation, therefore, only a proper assessment of the context can be determinative.

The expressive variety of *šlḥ* piel, "send away, dismiss," is nevertheless impressive: the subject can be God, human beings, or natural objects (trees that send out their roots: Jer. 17:8); the direct object can be realized by natural persons, animals (Lev. 14:7,53; 16:10,21-22,26), or concrete objects, as well as by abstracts and collectives.

94. See above.
95. *HP,* 275.

A large proportion of the occurrences with their differing meanings do remain within the simple bivalent construction, without further facultative additions. Only for the domain of interpersonal communication does the meaning range from the amicable "bid someone farewell" (Gen. 32:27[26]; 1 S. 9:26), "release slaves" (Ex. 21:26-27; Isa. 45:13; 58:6; Jer. 34:9,10[bis],11,14,16) through the indifferent "divorce one's wife" (Dt. 21:14; 22:19,29; 24:4; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:8) to the unfriendly "send away" (Gen. 31:42) or the hostile "drive away" (2 S. 10:4; cf. Ex. 6:1; 11:11; *grš* has a similar meaning[96]).

The majority of the specialized meanings also appear in the bivalent construction, especially in the case of actants realized by animals, collectives, natural objects, and inanimate objects. Such usage includes the following: *šillaḥ maʿyānîm,* "make springs gush forth" (Ps. 104:10); *šillaḥ peraʿ,* "let one's hair grow long" (Ezk. 44:20); *šillaḥ resen,* "drop the reins" (Job 30:11); *šillaḥ m^e^ḏānîm,* "sow discord" (Prov. 6:14,19; 16:28); *šillaḥ bāʾēš,* "set on fire" (Jgs. 1:8; 20:48; 2 K. 8:12; Ps. 74:7).[97]

In Ex. 14:5 *(kî-šillaḥnû ʾeṯ-yiśrāʾēl),* Floss proposes the translation "allow to escape unnoticed."[98]

In 1 K. 20:34 *(waʾ^a^nî babb^e^rîṯ ʾ^a^šall^e^ḥeḵā wayyiḵroṯ-lô ḇ^e^rîṯ way^e^šall^e^ḥēhû),* van der Woude proposes the translation "give," finding a parallel to "certain passages in Ugaritic where *šlḥ* appears with the meaning 'give'" (cf. *šilluḥîm,* "dowry," 1 K. 9:16; Mic. 1:14).[99] The king of the Arameans, captured by Ahab, says to the Omride: "'I will give (them) to you with a solemn pledge.' Thus he promises to return to Ahab the cities taken by his father and offers to allow the establishment of bazaars in Damascus."[100] Apart from this text, there is no evidence of a shift of connotation to "hand over, surrender."

In Job 39:3 the simplest course is to translate *ḥeḇlêhem t^e^šallaḥnâ* as: "they [fem. — the mother animals] are rid of their [masc. — caused by the newborn] pains of childbirth."[101]

VI. Summary. We find *šillaḥ* both in trivalent construction, where its meaning is equivalent to that of the qal, and in bivalent construction, where its meaning is "send away, dismiss." In the bivalent construction, where the statement of the purpose or goal of the action is often added facultatively, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between the two constructions phenomenologically. In the case of the qal, there have been critical discussions as to whether a specialized meaning can be associated with certainty with a particular morphosyntactic form of *šālaḥ;* such evidence is largely lacking in the case of *šillaḥ.* In bivalent constructions, *šillaḥ* appears able to express any kind of activity through which an arbitrary first actant sets an equally arbitrary sec-

96. *HAL,* II, 1514.
97. See *HAL,* II, 1514-15.
98. P. 198.
99. P. 189.
100. Ibid., 190.
101. See *HAL,* II, 1514.

ond actant in separative motion; the action must be complete in itself — i.e., it does not lead to a second, subsequent action (in contrast to the qal).

Metaphorical and stereotyped usage is common, but is rarely definable in terms of special syntactic features. Generally the meaning of a particular form must be determined from the context, and therefore theological scholarship has approached *šillaḥ* contextually, analyzing its function in the plague cycle (Ex. 4:21–11:10),[102] in the purity laws of Lev. 14–16, or in the sense of "divorce" in the marriage regulations of Deuteronomy (Dt. 21:14; 22:19,29; 24:1,3,4).[103]

VII. Niphal, Pual, Hiphil. The only instance of the niphal (*weništôaḥ sepārîm beyaḏ hārāṣîm 'el . . .*, Est. 3:13) is a passive variant of the sending of a messenger expressed actively by *šālaḥ* (qal) *beyaḏ*,[104] as in Est. 8:10. The niphal in Est. 3:13 is accounted for by the peculiarity of Est. 3:12-14, where six niphal predicates and a series of terms belonging to Persian administrative vocabulary suggest that the conspiracy involves officials at the highest level. Why v. 13 uses the infinitive absolute *(nišlôaḥ)* instead of a finite verb form is unclear.[105]

Of the 10 occurrences of the pual, 3 denote passively the sending of messengers (Ob. 1; Prov. 17:11; Dnl. 10:11). Since the corresponding active sense of the piel is familiar (1 S. 11:7; Isa. 43:14),[106] there is no problem here. The same is true for Isa. 50:1, where *ûḇepiš'êḵem šullehâ 'immeḵem*, "because of your sins your mother was divorced," follows a synonymous active occurrence of the piel in the same verse. Also straightforward is Gen. 44:3, where guests are "sent on their way" (cf. the active formulation with the piel in Gen. 12:20).

The metaphorical use of the ptcp. *mešullāḥ*, "set loose, scattered," displays great variety. Isa. 16:2 compares the daughters of Moab to "scattered nestlings" (*ke'ôp nôḏēḏ qēn mešullāḥ*, lit. "like fluttering bird, a scattered nest"). Similarly, a "deserted habitation" (*nāweh mešullāḥ*, Isa. 27:10) is a city taken in battle and depopulated; a "truant youth" (*na'ar mešullāḥ*, Prov. 29:15) is an unrestrained child who brings disgrace to his mother.

Finally, in 2 occurrences *šullaḥ beraglāyw* (lit. "be sent on one's feet") means simply "on foot." In Jgs. 5:15 Barak goes into the valley on foot; Job 18:8 may be translated "for on foot [or: with his feet] he goes into the net, and his way leads over webbing [concealing a pit]."

The 4 instances of the hiphil correspond in meaning and construction to forms of the piel of the type *šillaḥ be*, "let something loose upon someone."[107] As in the case of the piel, God is always the subject of such an action; the second actant is some convenient instrument of punishment: wild animals (Lev. 26:22; cf. the piel in Dt. 32:24), enemies (2 K. 15:37; cf. the piel in 2 K. 24:2), famine (Ezk. 14:13; Am. 8:11; cf. the piel in Ezk. 5:16).

102. Floss, 181-235.
103. Scharbert, 216, 219-20.
104. See IV above.
105. *HAL*, II, 1514.
106. See V above.
107. See IV above.

VIII. 1. *LXX.* In the case of the LXX it is possible to say: "ἀποστέλλειν is the Gk. term for the OT שׁלח."[108] Gk. *apóstolos* was accordingly used to translate the verbal noun *šālîaḥ*, derived from Heb. *šlḥ*, which in the Mishnah[109] denotes someone with a general power of attorney *(kmwtw šlwḥw šl 'dm).*[110] Apart from this, there is nothing unusual about the translation of *šlḥ* by the LXX. The instances where *šālaḥ* has the specialized sense of prophetic "commissioning" are rendered by both *apostéllein* (Isa. 6:8; 48:16) and *exapostéllein* (Jgs. 6:14). The combination *šālaḥ yāḏ* is generally translated with *ekteínein cheíra* (Gen. 3:22; 8:9; etc.). The piel calls for a greater variety of translations, but they correspond to the meanings discussed in the text.

Hossfeld-van der Velden

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šlḥ* occurs about 90 times, of which some 30 percent are in texts not published at the time of writing or will not be considered because they appear in fragmentary contexts. There are 14 occurrences of the stereotyped expression "extend one's hand(s)." The other occurrences, which do not differ significantly from OT usage, may be categorized as follows:

a. A first group incorporates or interprets biblical texts. For example, 4Q252 1 1:14-16 recounts events from the story of the deluge (Gen. 8:8,10) and 3:6-7 from Gen. 22:10. The occurrences in the book of Jubilees (4Q218 2 2; 221 5 7; 223 2 1:34; 4:31) refer to the Jacob narratives, and those in 4Q422 2 4-6 probably refer to negotiations with Pharaoh from Exodus.

Proclamation of the law is involved in 11QT 26:12 (the Day of Atonement from Lev. 16); 65:4; 66:11 (Dtn legislation; cf. also 4Q159 2-4 10). A supplement to the Dtn law concerning the king in 11QT 58:4-10 stipulates the levy of soldiers that each city must send for a war of the king (between 10 and 50 percent of the men capable of bearing arms); the percentage depends on the severity of the threat and the requirements of the moment. According to 4Q216 1 2:12 (Jub. 1:12), witnesses *('dym)* were sent to the people to encourage obedience to the laws of Moses; these witness were not listened to but killed. The interpretation of Hos. 2:10(8) also speaks of "rejection of the law that God had sent them through his servants the prophets" (4QpHosª 2:4-5).

Samuel's calling of David "from following the flock" (2 S. 7:8; cf. also Am. 7:15) is described in 11QPsª 28:8-10 (Ps. 151).

The *pᵉšārîm* interpret the OT text as applying to the present and future of the community. Ps. 37:14-15 refers to "the godless of Ephraim and Manasseh, who sought to stretch out their hand against the priest and the men of his council," i.e., against the teacher of righteousness and his disciples (4QpPsª 2:17).[111] Ps. 37:32-33 refers to the wicked priest who sought to kill the just man (4QpPsª 4:8-9); with an assignment of suffixes to appropriate antecedents, the expression "the law for the sake of which he

108. Rengstorf, 400.
109. Mish. *Ber.* 5:5.
110. Rengstorf, 415-16.
111. Lohse, 298.

sent to him" could be a reference to 4QMMT. According to the interpretation of Hos. 5:14a, the last (messianic) priest will stretch forth his hand to smite and destroy Ephraim (4QpHos[b] 2:3).

b. Another group of occurrences is concentrated in the rules governing the life of the community, where one use of *šlḥ* is as a technical term for expulsion. Transgressions leading to permanent expulsion include defamation of the community (1QS 7:16// 4QS[g] 6:2), complaining about the foundation of the community (1QS 7:17), contact with someone who has been excluded (7:25), deliberate or accidental transgression of the law (8:22), failure to observe the internal rules of the community (CD 20:3), and general insubordination (4Q266 18 5:8). Someone who has been excluded must leave the community, and no one must inquire into his fate (4Q266 18 5:14-15). The three occurrences in 4Q266 stand out, because they use the hithpael of *šlḥ*, otherwise unattested until Middle Hebrew. The various transgressions and punishments are juxtaposed with all their discrepancies, giving evidence of some historical development.

The priest ranks first in the table hierarchy of the community (1QS 6:5//4QS[d] 1 2:9; 1QSa 2:18; 4Q271 1 2:4[?]), even before the messiah of Israel (1QSa 2:20). Other regulations forbid having a foreigner carry out a member's own wish on the Sabbath (CD 11:2), sending a sacrifice to the altar by the hand of someone who is impure (CD 11:18//4Q271 3 1:12), or shedding the blood of a Gentile (CD 12:6//4Q271.3 1:21). The disparaging gesture of pointing one's finger at someone, mentioned in Isa. 58:29, if used by an outsider, is to be answered meekly by a member of the community (1QS 11:2).

c. The hymnic literature uses the root in a variety of themes and motifs. The occurrences in 1QH are limited to the "song of the teacher" in 8:4ff. Vv. 5-10 distinguish the trees of life, which send forth their roots toward the water (= wisdom, *tôrâ*), and the trees of water, which do not do so — an image reflecting the history of the community's origin.[112] L. 34 appears in a series of self-deprecatory statements: "It was impossible (for me) to move one step forward *(šlḥ pʿm)*."

Assurance of deliverance and trust in God are voiced in 4Q381 29 2, 4: God "will send his angels" and "stretch forth his hand" to bring help. Despite the very fragmentary condition of the text, its similarity to or dependence on Ps. 18//2 S. 22 is clear. In 4Q381 33 4-5, toward the end of a psalm, the psalmist even goes so far as to expect that "you will send out your spirit and give your compassion to the son of your truth."

Confessional insight into the psalmist's own sinfulness is reflected in 4Q504 1-2 3:13; 6:8. An historical retrospect states that God "sent his servants the prophets to announce evil at the end of days" (3:12-14). In 6:8 the psalmist is aware that it is God who "sent our enemies against us."

According to 11QApPs[a] 3:5-7, a ritual text to ward off demons (?), God will send *(šlḥ)* an angel (cf. 4Q381 29 2 above) to do battle with the "demon" (probably Belial; cf. 1:4-6) and cast *(šlḥ)* him down into the great abyss and deepest Sheol, destroying forever his power over the earth.

112. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit. SUNT* 2 (1963), 256-61.

d. The occurrences in 4Q412-418 and 424 stand well within the tradition of OT wisdom. They display no shade of meaning specific to Qumran: "Do not stretch out your hand toward [. . .], lest you be burned and your body consumed by fire" (4Q416 2 3:4-5). General platitudes are cited in 4Q424, e.g., not to send the hard of hearing to investigate a judgment (3:4), or someone hardhearted to reach an agreement (3:6; see also 1:6; 3:3).

e. We find *šlḥ yd* used as a military term in 1QM 17:6 and 4QM^c 1:8. According to 1QM 17:13, God will not intervene personally in battle (as in 1QM 1:4-5,14-15), but will "send everlasting help through the power of the glorious angel."[113]

Dahmen

---

113. P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. SUNT* 6 (1969), 95-100; on the motif of the angel sent by God, see VIII.2.c above.

שֻׁלְחָן *šulḥān*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Syro-Palestine. III. OT: 1. Basic Meaning; 2. In Homes; 3. King's Table; 4. Table for the Bread of the Presence; 5. Sacrificial Tables; 6. Prophecy. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The word *šulḥān,* "table," is probably an abstract noun formed with the Common Semitic afformative *-ān* (like *qorbān* and **'oḇdān*).[1] The afformative *-ān,* which usually became *-ôn* in Hebrew, can hardly be explained as an Aramaism or a late formation;[2] more likely, the original vocalization was preserved for reasons of euphony.[3]

šulḥān. H. S. Baker, *Furniture in the Ancient World* (New York, 1966); T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem,* I-II. StFS 3 (1970-80); G. Dalman, *AuS,* VII (1942), esp. 218-24; H. G. Fischer, "Möbel," *LexÄg,* IV, 180-89, esp. 184; V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt. WMANT* 47 (1977); L. Goppelt, "τράπεζα," *TDNT,* VIII, 209-15; R. Heyer, "Ein archäologischer Beitrag zum Text KTU 1.4 I 23-43," *UF* 10 (1978) 93-109; E. Höhne and B. Reicke, "Tisch," *BHHW,* III, 1991-93; G. M. A. Richter, *Ancient Furniture* (Oxford, 1926); A. Salonen, *Die Möbel des Alten Mesopotamien nach sumerisch-akkadischen Quellen. AnAcScFen* B 127 (1963); A. van Selms, "A Guest-Room for Ilu and Its Furniture," *UF* 7 (1975) 469-76; H. Weippert, "Möbel 3. Tisch," *BRL*², 230-31.

1. Meyer, II, §41.1.
2. *BLe,* §§14n, 61bθ-nθ.
3. *NSS,* §194b.

The etymology of *šulḥān* is uncertain. The formerly accepted theory of a root *šlḥ* II, "strip off hide," homonymous with *šlḥ* I, "send,"[4] is disproved by Ugar. *ṯlḥn*, "table."[5] This discovery casts doubt on the hypothetical basic meaning "leather dining mat."[6]

Ugar. *ṯlḥn* is well attested;[7] it appears also as the name of a village northeast of Ugarit and as a gentilic.[8] Therefore a Proto-Semitic root *ṯlḥ* should be posited,[9] distinct from the root *šlḥ* (Ugar. *šlḥ*[10]); in Hebrew the sound shift *ṯ* > *š* made the two roots homonymous. It is possible, however, that *šulḥān* (Ugar. *ṯlḥn*) is a primary noun,[11] since no instances of *ṯlḥ* are known.

A connection with Imperial Aram. *šlḥ* (haphel and ithpeel, "strip off skin, take off") as well as with *š*^{e}*lāḥîm* in Cant. 4:13[12] is therefore ruled out, especially since even in Imperial Aramaic the existence of a root *šlḥ* II homonymous with *šlḥ* I is unlikely.[13] Arab. *slḥ* is an Aramaic loanword.[14] In Middle Hebrew, *šulḥān* is well attested.[15]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *šulḥān* occurs 71 times in the OT; 21 of these occurrences are in the books Exodus–Numbers, 21 in DtrH, 3 in Isaiah, 13 in Ezekiel, 2 in Malachi, 4 in Psalms, 1 each in Job, Proverbs, and Daniel, and 10 in ChrH. The Hebrew text of Sirach has 9 occurrences.[16]

3. *LXX.* Without exception, the LXX translates *šulḥān* with *trápeza,* "table." In eight passages it leaves *šulḥān* untranslated, usually for stylistic reasons. Because *trápeza* also has the transferred meaning "meal, food" (< "dining table"; cf. 1 S. 20:27,29),[17] it also appears as a translation of *leḥem,* "bread," *paṯ-bag,* "food," and *š*^{e}*'ēr,* "flesh." The Targums generally translate *šulḥān* with *pāṯûrâ,* "table."

II. Ancient Near East. In addition to chairs[18] and beds,[19] there are numerous ancient Near Eastern representations of tables, starting in the Early Bronze Age.

---

4. *GesB,* 833; *KBL*^{1}, 976-77; and many others.
5. J. Blau, *VT* 6 (1956) 243; *KBL*^{2} Sup, 190; M. Delcor and E. Jenni, *TLOT,* III, 1331.
6. See III.1 below.
7. *UT,* no. 2681; *WUS,* no. 2870; *CML*^{2}, 160.
8. *UT,* no. 2681; *WUS,* nos. 2871-72; M. C. Astour, *RSP,* II, 337.
9. Blau, *VT* 6 (1956) 243.
10. *UT,* no. 2419; *WUS,* nos. 2610-11.
11. *HAL,* II, 1519.
12. *KBL*^{2}, 976.
13. *DISO,* 302; cf. *WTM,* IV, 558; *ANH*^{3}, 424-25.
14. Brockelmann, *LexSyr,* 780.
15. *WTM,* IV, 560.
16. D. Barthélemy and O. Rickenbacher, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Sirach* (Göttingen, 1973), 403.
17. See III.1-2 below.
18. → כסא *kissē'.*
19. → ערש *'ereś.*

1. *Egypt.* Egyptian illustrations picture mostly dining tables, rarely sacrificial tables or work tables.[20] In the early period we find mostly small round tables of stone supported by a central pedestal, dividing into three or four legs about halfway down.[21] This form is increasingly displaced by rectangular tables of wood, common since the Old Kingdom.[22] The legs, usually straight, are reinforced by stretchers halfway up; in the New Kingdom, diagonal braces in the upper section also appear.[23] We also find three-legged tables with their legs splayed or terminating in animal feet,[24] a common motif in the ancient Near East.

2. *Mesopotamia.* In Mesopotamia, too, tables (Sum. *ban-šur* > Akk. *paššuru* > Aram. *pāṯûrā'*) were among the furnishings of aristocratic houses as early as the 3d millennium. Almost all the types known from Egypt are represented.[25] At least as early as the 8th century — but probably substantially earlier[26] — we find folding tables with crossed legs,[27] frequently serving as offering tables.[28] As a rule, tables tended to be small, but a table for seventeen, almost 20 feet long, is also described.[29]

3. *Syro-Palestine.* In the Syro-Palestinian region there is evidence for the use of tables before the appearance of the Israelites. Forms and materials recall both Egyptian and Mesopotamian tables. A sarcophagus relief of King Aḥiram of Gebal (11th/10th century) depicts a four-legged rectangular (square?) table similar to the Mesopotamian type.[30]

Ugaritic texts likewise confirm that tall tables on legs were widespread (cf. such expressions as *tḥt ṯlḥnt,* "under the tables"[31]). A "dining table" is also mentioned.[32] Besides chairs *(ks')* and stools *(hdm),* Anat's palace contains at least two tables,[33] and perhaps more.[34] A table is also part of the furniture of the room that Athirat prepares for El.[35] A bowl probably rested on this table (cf. Ex. 25:29; Nu. 4:7), apparently for the offering of animal sacrifice. Does this single table combine functions that the OT divides between table and altar?[36] The dimensions and form of the table are not stated.

---

20. *ANEP,* no. 133.
21. Baker, ills. 18ff.; Weippert, 230.
22. But see Baker, ill. 172.
23. See the illustrations in Fischer, 185; and Baker, ills. 231-45.
24. Baker, ills. 105a-c, and passim.
25. Salonen, pls. 30-34; Baker, ills. 253-54, 303ff.
26. Höhne, 1991-92; Baker, ill. 267 (!).
27. Salonen, pls. 32.1, 57; Baker, ills. 289-90, 338; *ANEP,* nos. 451, 637.
28. *ANEP,* nos. 630-33; cf. 623-26.
29. Salonen, 269; on the variety of materials used see also 213-61.
30. *BHHW,* III, pl. 52c.; *ANEP,* nos. 456-58.
31. *KTU* 1.114, 5-9; see also *HAL,* II, 1519-20.
32. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 35-36.
33. *KTU* 1.3, II, 30.
34. See ll. 36-37.
35. *KTU* 1.4, I, 38.
36. Van Selms, 475.

Archaeological evidence from Ugarit shows that the round Egyptian-style table with a divided central pedestal was also known.[37] A largely intact round tabletop measures 43.3 inches in diameter. Ivory inlays commonly make use of animal motifs.[38]

III. OT.

1. *Basic Meaning.* The connection with Ugar. *ṯlḥn* as well as the evidence of tall tables made of stone, wood, or metal (overlays), standing on from one to four legs, in Israel's milieu make it unlikely that Heb. *šulḥān* has a basic meaning other than "table." Lacking tables and chairs, ordinary people, especially in rural areas, may well have spread out a leather dining mat on the ground for their food;[39] but no text suggests that such a mat would have been called a *šulḥān*.[40] Would there have been a special word for it? There is no evidence. Texts that reflect a nomadic or seminomadic way of life generally do not mention placing food on anything, but speak simply of "sitting and eating" and "drinking" (Gen. 18:8; 24:33; 25:34; 37:25; Ex. 24:11; etc.; also cf. an Assyrian illustration with Gen. 31:46[41]).

It would be reckless to draw conclusions about the form of table from the petition in Ps. 69:23(Eng. 22) "let their table be a trap for them" *(y^e^hî-šulḥānām lipnêhem l^e^pāḥ).*[42] First, this passage clearly uses *paḥ* in the metaphorical sense of "ruin" (cf. Ps. 91:3; Josh. 23:13; etc.); second, *šulḥānām* in parallel with *šalmêhem* (the usual emendation, following Tg.) probably refers to the joyous (sacrificial) feast of the psalmist's enemies:[43] May God bring to (well-deserved) ruin those who now — obviously within the temple precincts — are taking part in sacrificial celebrations and are sure of their ground.[44]

The point of Isa. 21:5 — a difficult text — appears to be similar: the Babylonian commanders, now feasting in security at their festively laid table, will suddenly be summoned to devastating battle — "Rise up, commanders, oil the shield!"[45]

Does the expression *ʿrk šulḥān* (Isa. 21:5; 65:11; Ezk. 23:41; Ps. 23:5; 78:19; Prov. 9:2) — in contrast to *ʿrk ʿal (šulḥān)* in Ex. 40:22-23 — suggest a "spread out" table, originally a piece of leather?[46] The context of these texts, all of which are probably late, makes it more likely that *ʿrk šulḥān* refers to "laying a table" or — by extension — preparation of a meal.[47] The Israelites test God by asking, "Can God lay a table in the wilderness?" (Ps. 78:19). The question is continued in v. 20: "Can he also give bread *(leḥem)* or provide meat *(š^e^ʾēr)* for his people?" Here *šulḥān* parallels *š^e^ʾēr* and *leḥem;*

---

37. See the illustration of a stele in *BRL*², ill. 83; Heyer, 105, ill. 23.
38. Heyer, 104-6, with ill. 22.
39. *GesB,* 833; *AuS,* VII, 218-20.
40. *HAL,* II, 1520.
41. B. Meissner, *BuA,* I, 418, ill. 135.
42. *GesB,* 833; Reicke, 1992; D. Kellermann, → XI, 514.
43. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁴1926), 296, 299.
44. *HAL,* II, 1520.
45. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 319-21.
46. → XI, 355.
47. *AuS,* VII, 219.

elsewhere it parallels *'ōḵel,* "food" (Ps. 78:18; cf. Isa. 21:5), *msk yayin,* "mixed wine" (Prov. 9:2), and *šth,* "drink" (Isa. 21:5; cf. Prov. 9:5).[48]

2. *In Homes.* The table, an "achievement" of civilization,[49] was probably a familiar item in Israel from at least the period of the monarchy, but it can hardly have been among the regular furnishings of an Israelite house.

The OT says nothing about the form, material, or dimensions of ordinary dining tables; this information must be extracted from comparative evidence[50] and descriptions of the cultic table.[51] We should probably picture rectangular (?) wooden tables, usually small.

Tables are mentioned in the rooms of the wealthy (2 K. 4:10; Job 36:16[?]; Ps. 128:3), a prophet (1 K. 13:20; cf. Isa. 28:7-8[?]), and people holding high political office (1 K. 13:20, Babylonian commanders; 1 K. 18:19, Jezebel; Neh. 5:17, Nehemiah). A table was also part of the standard furnishings of the king's house. The king's table accounts for 13 of the roughly 22 occurrences of *šulḥān* outside cultic contexts.

A bed or table can betoken wealth, comfort, or even luxury (Am. 3:12; 6:4; Isa. 21:5; Ezk. 23:41; Ps. 128:3; Job 36:16; Prov. 7:16; cf. Prov. 9:2). Thus the furnishings of the room that the Shunammite offers Elisha for his frequent visits are out of the ordinary. A walled (!) roof chamber with bed, table, chair, and lamp[52] is something special (2 K. 4:10). She is a "wealthy" or "aristocratic" woman (*'iššâ g^eḏôlâ,* v. 8; cf. 5:1); the room is a token of her wealth as well as of her respect for the man of God.

There was probably also a table in the house of the old prophet who lived in Bethel (1 K. 13:20; cf. Isa. 28:7-8[?]). The expression *hēm yōš^eḇîm 'el-haššulḥān* shows that he and the man of God from Judah were "facing the table,"[53] which was "in front of" them (*lip̱nê;* cf. Ezk. 23:41; Ps. 23:5). But the meaning shifts easily to the extended sense of *šulḥān;* here "sitting at the table" simply means "eating" (cf. 1 K. 13:19,22, and passim; 1 S. 20:24,27,29).

Ps. 128:3 commends the man who fears God: "your sons are like olive shoots around your table." Similarly, the crowd around Solomon's table and the (fine) food upon it (1 K. 10:5//2 Ch. 9:4; cf. 1 K. 5:7[4:27]) are not a matter of course: they are the consequence of Yahweh's blessing and his love for Israel. The dazzled queen of Sheba acknowledges as much and praises Yahweh (1 K. 10:9 [Dtr?];[54] Ps. 128:5-6).

3. *King's Table.* The "king's table" is primarily the (great) table in the royal dining room (1 S. 20:29,34) around which — especially on feast days (1 S. 20:18,24ff.: *ḥōḏeš,* "new moon") — the members of the king's inner circle assemble at meal time. The par-

48. See III.2 below.
49. Fritz, 140.
50. See II above.
51. See III.4-5 below.
52. → VIII, 402.
53. M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 291.
54. Ibid., 208, 226.

ticipants and their places are clearly defined (1 S. 20:25;[55] 1 K. 10:5). When Saul "sits at table" (*yšb 'el-halleḥem* [*Q*], 1 S. 20:24; *bw' 'el-šulḥān hammelek̠*, v. 29) on the day of the new moon, he is disturbed by the absence of David, whose "place" remains empty (v. 25; cf. 16:11).

The phrase *šulḥān hammelek̠* is not normally used in this literal sense. The single possible exception is 2 S. 9:7ff. For the sake of Jonathan and in fulfillment of his oath, David restores to Mephibosheth (Merib-baal) and his family the land of his grandfather Saul (vv. 7,12) and also personally grants him access to his table: "and you yourself shall eat at my table daily" (*wᵉ'attâ tōk̠ᵉal leḥem 'al-šulḥānî tāmîḏ*, v. 7; cf. vv. 10,11,13; 19:29). But this expression does not necessarily mean eating at the personal table of the king; more likely it has the extended sense of recruitment into David's court (cf. v. 10aα).[56]

The other occurrences are clearly meant to be understood in the sense of recruitment into the royal court and maintenance "at public expense." For example, in 1 K. 2:7 David counsels Solomon to let the sons of Barzillai (his progeny) "be among those who eat at your table" (*wᵉhāyû bᵉ'ōk̠ᵉlê šulḥānek̠ᵉā;* cf. 2 S. 19:34[33]: *wᵉk̠ilkaltî 'ōṯᵉk̠ā 'immāḏî bîrûšālāyim*). It is also clear in 1 K. 5:7(4:27) (pre-Dtr?[57]) that "all who have access to the table of King Solomon" does not refer to his table companions in the narrow sense but to those maintained at the king's expense (cf. vv. 2-3).[58] The same is true of the 150 Judahite officials along with foreigners whom Nehemiah magnanimously maintains at his own expense (*'al-šulḥānî*, Neh. 5:17), out of concern for the already impoverished people.[59]

When 1 K. 18:19 says that the 450 prophets of Baal (and the 400 prophets of Asherah) "eat at Jezebel's table" *('ōk̠ᵉlê šulḥān 'îzāḇel)*, i.e., are in her service and are supported by her, the statement is probably meant as an implied criticism of Ahab (cf. 16:31 [Dtr]).

In Jgs. 1:7, when Adoni-bezek says, "Seventy kings with their thumbs and big toes cut off used to pick up scraps under my table," he hardly means this literally. In his own fate he experiences God's just vengeance. Is he turning his own "boast" (cf. Gen. 4:15,24) into a confession of sin?

4. *Table for the Bread of the Presence.* a. *Temple of Solomon.* In the Solomonic temple, according to 1 K. 7:48, a golden table for the bread of the Presence stood before the *dᵉḇîr (haššulḥān 'ᵃšer 'ālāyw leḥem happānîm zāhāḇ)*. No further information is given, but we may presume a wooden table overlaid with gold (cf. 6:20-21), probably rectangular (like the "wheeled basin stands," 7:27-39) and standing on four legs.[60]

Although the existence of such a table in the First Temple can hardly be doubted,

55. H. J. Stoebe, *Erste Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 388.
56. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1964), 301.
57. Noth, *Könige I*, 62.
58. Ibid., 78.
59. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 92-93.
60. See also III.5 below.

7:48 is often viewed as a secondary addition based on P.[61] But the formulation of v. 48bβ fits the context well (cf. vv. 23,27,49, etc.); and the anarthrous acc. *zāhāḇ* denoting the material ("made of gold") is hardly an addition stuck on in an inappropriate place,[62] as the similar formulation in v. 16 shows. Only v. 48bα conflicts with 6:20-21, if we do not identify the cedar altar (*mizbēaḥ 'ārez,* 6:20) with the table from the outset[63] or assume that the incense burner stood on the table, so that the table for the bread of the Presence served as an incense altar.[64]

The bread of the Presence as a form of alimentary offering was apparently already a feature of Israelite sanctuaries in the premonarchic period (1 S. 21:7[6]), but the display of loaves of bread on a table is first attested for Israel as an innovation of the Solomonic period, and is hence a borrowing from Canaanite cultic practice.[65]

The statements in Chronicles about the table for the bread of the Presence are inconsistent. The text of 2 Ch. 13:11 (cf. 29:18) mentions a single table in the First Temple; this passage thus also reflects its existence in the Second Temple (cf. 1 Mc. 1:22). The formulation *ma'ᵃreḵeṯ leḥem 'al-haššulḥān* or more briefly *šulḥān hamma'ᵃreḵeṯ,* "table of the rows (of bread)" (e.g., 29:18), is typical of the Chronicler. It is probably based on Lev. 24:6-7 (P^S; cf. Ex. 40:4,23).[66]

On the other hand, the mention of ten tables in the Chronicler's account of the building of the temple (2 Ch. 4:8) has no parallel in 1 K. 6–7. Their purpose is also unclear. Did they serve as bases for the lampstands (v. 7)[67] or, more likely, for the hundred golden basins (v. 8b)? The text of 2 Ch. 4:19 (par. 1 K. 7:48) speaks of "the tables on which the bread of the Presence (lay)," probably conflating the prototype 1 K. 7:48 with 2 Ch. 4:8, but in any case erroneously identifying the "ten tables" as "tables for the bread of the Presence."

In 1 Ch. 28:14-18 we have an interpolation.[68] Only here are "silver tables" (*šulḥᵃnôṯ hakkāsep,* v. 16) mentioned alongside the golden tables *(šulḥᵃnôṯ hamma'ᵃreḵeṯ);* their function is not stated.

b. *Tabernacle.* Corresponding to the presence of a table for the bread of the Presence in the Solomonic temple, the priestly instructions for the tabernacle contain a description of an analogous table (Ex. 25:23-30; cf. 37:10-16 P^S). The instructions are very detailed: the table, made of acacia wood overlaid with gold, is to be two cubits long, one cubit wide, and a cubit and a half high — approximately 36 in. × 18 in. × 27 in. (v. 23). It is to have a golden molding *(zēr)* — apparently around its top — as well as a *misgereṯ* a handbreadth wide, likewise with a golden molding around it.

The meaning and function of the *misgereṯ* are disputed. Highly unlikely is the

61. E.g., Noth, *Könige I,* 166.
62. Fritz, 141 n. 119.
63. Noth, *Könige I,* 121-22.
64. Busink, I, 288-93.
65. Fritz, 141ff.; → לחם *leḥem.*
66. → VII, 526.
67. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 209.
68. Ibid., 185.

much-discussed definition of it as a "rim" or "frame" above or beneath the tabletop.[69] It is more likely that the *misgeret̲* is an underframing connecting the legs about halfway down.[70] There are two reasons for this interpretation: first, the possible derivation of the noun from *sgr* I, which suggests a bracing structure "enclosing" the legs; second, the need for such "bracing" of the legs for stability, especially if the table was to be lifted by its legs, as shown in a representation from Khorsabad.[71]

If the *misgeret̲* is an underframing in the middle of the legs, this also explains the attachment of four golden rings, one at each leg, "close to the underframing" (Ex. 25:27), i.e., at its height. With the aid of two poles *(baddîm)* of acacia wood overlaid with gold, which can be run through the rings, the table can be lifted effortlessly some four inches above the ground. The representation of this table on the Arch of Titus[72] is difficult to interpret, but here too one can recognize remnants of the underframing halfway up the legs, apparently knocked out (cf. 2 K. 16:17).[73]

Consonant with its position in the Solomonic temple, the table is to be set "outside the curtain" (Ex. 26:35), according to P^S on the north side of the tabernacle (40:22; 26:35b P^S [?]).[74] It serves for the continual *(tāmîḏ)* display of the bread of the Presence (*leḥem* [*hap*]*pānîm*, 25:30; 35:13; 39:36):[75] twelve loaves, as subsequently stated by P^S (Lev. 24:6). Later, "vessels" *(kēlîm)* are also placed on it (Ex. 37:16 P^S; Nu. 4:7) — possibly a reflection of the postexilic cult. Ex. 25:29 is a secondary addition "intended to secure the manufacture of the cultic vessels."[76] The absence of this additional information shows that P is not (or not primarily) interested in the performance of cultic ceremonies; the perpetual display of the bread of the Presence instead expresses the expectation of Yahweh's coming or of his *kāḇôḏ* (Lev. 9:6).

c. *Ezekiel.* Ezk. 41:21b-22 speaks of a table that looked like "something resembling an altar" (*kᵉmar'ēh hammizbēaḥ* [cj.]), presupposing the distinction between table and altar.[77] Its altar-like appearance is reflected in its square shape (two cubits by two); its "corners" *(miqṣō'ôṯ)*, corresponding to the "horns" of the altar (cf. 43:15); and its "walls" (*qîrôṯ;* cf., e.g., Ex. 30:3). Clearly this passage refers to the table for the bread of the Presence: (a) it stands within the *hêḵāl* in front of the "holy place" (Ezk. 41:21); (b) it is "of wood"; and (c) it is called "the table that stands before Yahweh," probably an allusion to Ex. 35:30 *(lᵉpānay)*.[78] Although Ezk. 41:15b-26 is secondary,[79] vv. 21b

---

69. For a summary see Fritz, 139-40; cf. already Rashi in loc.

70. See II above; Fritz, 140.

71. *ANEP,* no. 623.

72. *AOB,* no. 509.

73. See also Busink, II, 1172, with ills. 250, 252.

74. Fritz, 120.

75. → VII, 525-26.

76. Fritz, 118; others disagree, e.g., J. I. Durham, *Exodus. WBC* 3 (1987), 361-62, arbitrarily harmonizes the difficult verse.

77. → מזבח *mizbēaḥ*.

78. See the reconstruction in Busink, II, ill. 190.

79. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 386-87.

and 22 do not reflect the postexilic temple.[80] Does not this observation also suggest that the vision is "genuine," or at least can hardly be postexilic?

5. *Sacrificial Tables.* Ezk. 40:38-43 — also secondary,[81] but surely not of a piece — speaks of eight tables on which sacrifices were to be slaughtered, standing within the northern (?) gate structure: two each to the right and left in its vestibule and two each outside its vestibule (vv. 39-40).[82] According to v. 39, this is where the burnt offering,[83] the sin offering,[84] and the guilt offering[85] were to be slaughtered. V. 42, however, speaks only of the *'ōlâ* and the sacrifice.[86] V. 43b, probably "tertiary,"[87] calls the offerings collectively *bᵉśar haqqorbān,* "the flesh of the offering."[88] Only the tables for the burnt offering, inside the vestibule, are described. Made of hewn stone *('aḇnê gāzîṯ),* they are a cubit and a half long, a cubit and a half wide, and a cubit high (v. 42a). Busink offers a reconstruction of the gate area.[89]

6. *Prophecy.* No prophetic denunciation could express the lack of religious and moral knowledge on the part of priests and prophets more drastically than Isa. 28:8: "All tables are covered with vomit, with filth, so that no space is left" (cf. 1:10-17). What tables are meant? The passage suggests tables set up in the temple precincts for a communal sacrificial feast. This interpretation is also suggested by Ps. 69:23(22) (cf. Isa. 21:5)[90] and the complementary text Ps. 23:5. Beyerlin[91] has argued convincingly that the latter refers to a sacrificial feast ("*tôḏâ* ceremony") during which the psalmist, having experienced deliverance, gives thanks to Yahweh: "You lay the table before — in the face of — my enemies."[92]

Malachi, too, indicts the disgraceful conduct of the priests, debating the imagined words of his enemies: "The table of Yahweh, it is worthless" (*niḇzeh,* Mal. 1:7) or "polluted" (*mᵉgō'āl,* 1:12). Only here does *šulḥān* refer to the altar (par. *mizbēaḥ,* vv. 7,10). Or may we conclude from the "polluted bread" *(leḥem mᵉgō'āl)* in v. 7 that in the prophet's critique altar and table are one?

Isa. 65:11 and Ezk. 23:41 base prophecies of judgment to come on transgression of the first commandment. Those "who set a table for (the god) Gad [NRSV: Fortune],

---

80. See III.4.b above.
81. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 365-66.
82. Cf. MT.
83. → עלה *'ōlâ.*
84. → חטא *ḥāṭā'.*
85. → אשׁם *'āšām.*
86. → זבח *zāḇaḥ.*
87. H.-J. Fabry, → XIII, 156-57.
88. → קרבן *qorbān.*
89. Vol. II, ills. 177, 181.
90. See III.1 above.
91. W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen. FRLANT* 99 (1970), 111-16.
92. On Ps. 78:19 see III.1 above; on 128:3 see III.2 above.

who fill the cup of mixed wine for (the god) Meni [NRSV: Destiny]" are destined for the sword (Isa. 65:11-12) — in contrast to Yahweh's "servants," who will flourish (vv. 8ff.). Ezk. 23:41 (secondary) also probably alludes to cultic idolatry.[93] Israel, embodied in the adulterous sisters Oholah and Oholibah, is described metaphorically: "And you sat down on a decked [cj.] couch, and before you [cj.] was a laid table *(šulḥān ʿārûḵ)*, and on it you placed my incense and oil."

Prov. 1–9 draws on the prophetic critique and prophecies of coming judgment. Wisdom "has set her table" (9:2) and summons guests to the feast, as a poetically personified offer of Yahweh's salvation also summoning them to life (v. 6). The ways of the "strange woman," however, lead to death (7:27; 9:18). Her call to idolatry (7:10-22) and evil is the call of Folly herself (9:13ff.).

In Ezk. 39:20 *šulḥān* appears in a prophetic oracle of the future (cf. also Dnl. 11:27). In his vision of the attack and defeat of Gog, the prophet is commissioned to invite all the birds and beasts of the field to Yahweh's great sacrificial feast *(zeḇaḥ)* on the mountains of Israel and to gorge themselves on flesh, fat, and blood. "You shall be filled at my table, with horses and chariots [?], with warriors and all kinds of soldiers — oracle of the Lord Yahweh."

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The word *šulḥān* occurs seven times in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Three passages refer to the "laid" table of the community (1QS 6:4), called in 1QSa 2:17 (bis) *(h)šlḥn (h)yḥd*, "table of unity [?]."[94] In the cultic instructions for the Israel of the age of salvation, the War Scroll mentions a "table of glory" *(šwlḥn kbwd)*, not further defined, at which the priests "refresh themselves perpetually" (1QM 2:5-6) — apparently a reference to the table for the bread of the Presence. In the draft plan of the Temple Scroll, the (very fragmentary) description of the area devoted to the altar cult mentions a table (11QT 3:1). At the wall of the inner courtyard, tables and seats are to be provided for the priests, for the consumption of certain cultic offerings (37:8-10).[95] The context and meaning of the last occurrence, in the fragment 5Q16 2 3, cannot be determined.

Ernst

93. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1970), 333.

94. → VI, 47-48.

95. J. Maier, *Temple Scroll. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. tr. 1985), 36.

שָׁלַט *šālaṭ*; שַׁלִּיט *šallîṭ*; שִׁלְטוֹן *šolṭān*

I. Root. II. Forms and Occurrences: 1. Hebrew; 2. Aramaic; 3. Lexical Field. III. General Usage: 1. Hebrew; 2. Aramaic. IV. Theological Usage. V. 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. LXX.

I. Root. The root *šlṭ* constitutes a word family widely attested in Semitic, appearing in such lexemes as Arab. *saliṭa*[1] and Eth. *šallaṭa*, "have power";[2] Akk. *šalāṭu*, "rule";[3] and Ugar. *šlṭ*, "ruler"[4] (also *šlyṭ* as an epithet of Leviathan, "the mighty one with seven heads"[5]). It appears to be especially common in the domains of Aramaic[6] and Syriac,[7] as its OT occurrences illustrate;[8] it has been claimed that the Hebrew words are "undoubtedly Aramaic loanwords."[9] The meaning of the word family is always associated with "power"; usually it denotes the possession and especially the exercise of power, "rule." As a personal epithet, it characterizes someone who exercises power of whatever kind, usually a "potentate" or "ruler."

The Hebrew noun *šeleṭ* denotes a kind of weapon. Its precise meaning is uncertain,[10] but it appears several times in parallel with → מגן *māgēn*, "shield." It probably does not derive from the root *šlṭ*[11] but should be considered a primary noun.[12]

šālaṭ. M. J. Dahood, "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth," *Bibl* 33 (1952) 30-52, 191-221, esp. 205; idem, "The Phoenician Background of Qoheleth," *Bibl* 47 (1966) 264-82, esp. 274-75; D. C. Fredericks, *Qoheleth's Language. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies* 3 (Lewiston, 1988), esp. 240-41; E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im AT*, I (Halle, 1902), esp. 88-90; N. Lohfink, "*melek, šallîṭ* und *môšēl* bei Kohelet und die Abfassungszeit des Buchs," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 535-43, esp. 541-43; K. Scholtissek, *Vollmacht im AT und Judentum. Paderborner theologische Studien* 24 (1993); J. A. Soggin, "משל *mšl* to rule," *TLOT*, II, 689-91, esp. 689; Wagner, esp. 113-14.

1. Wehr, 422.

2. Dillmann, *LexLingAeth*, 233.

3. *AHw*, III, 1147; *CAD*, XVII/1, 238-40.

4. *WUS*, no. 2612.

5. *KTU* 1.3, III, 42; 1.5, I, 3, 29-30; see *UT*, no. 2423; Wagner, 114; *HAL*, II, 1524.

6. On Jewish Aramaic see *ChW*, II, 484-85; Jastrow, 1581-82; on other Aramaic dialects see *DISO*, 302.

7. Brockelmann, *LexSyr*, 781; see also in general *DISO*, 302f.; cf. F. Rosenthal, *Aramaic Handbook. PLO* X (1967), I/2, 74; Kautzsch.

8. See II.1 below.

9. *BLe*, §2r; cf. Wagner, 114.

10. *GesTh*, 1418; *HAL*, II, 1522-23.

11. D. N. Freedman and M. P. O'Connor, → VIII, 84.

12. *BLe*, §61j′; R. Borger, *VT* 22 (1972) 385-98; A. Guillaume, *AbrN* 3 (1961/62) 9; *HAL*, II, 1522-23; also Lisowsky, 1445, or *BDB*, 1020, where it is derived with a root *šlṭ* II. Others disagree: Mandelkern, 1179, and Even-Shoshan, 2134-35, assume a single root *šlṭ*; *GesB*, 834: "uncertain."

II. Forms and Occurrences. In the OT the word family of *šlṭ* is more common in Aramaic (33 times) than in Hebrew (15 times).

1. *Hebrew.* Of the 15 Hebrew occurrences, 8 are verb forms: 5 in the qal (Eccl. 2:19; 8:9; Est. 9:1 [bis]; Neh. 5:15) and 3 in the hiphil (Ps. 119:133; Eccl. 5:18[Eng. 19]; 6:2). The 7 nominal occurrences are distributed among three derivatives: 2 occurrences of *šilṭôn* (Eccl. 8:4,8; cf. also Sir. 4:7), 1 of *šalleṭeṯ* (Ezk. 16:30),[13] and finally 4 of *šallîṭ* (Gen. 42:6; Eccl. 7:19; 8:8; 10:5; cf. also Sir. 9:13). It is striking that of the 15 occurrences of *šlṭ* 9 are in Ecclesiastes. The Genesis passage is probably early;[14] it has been assigned to both J[15] and E[16] — unless the words *hû' haššallîṭ ʿal-hāʾāreṣ* are "a later explanatory gloss."[17] All the other occurrences are very late.

2. *Aramaic.* Of the 33 Aramaic occurrences, all but 2 (Ezr. 4:20; 7:24) are from the Aramaic sections of Daniel; the word family is not attested at all in the Hebrew sections. Of the 33 occurrences, 7 are verb forms: 5 in the peal (Dnl. 2:39; 3:27; 5:7,16; 6:25[24]) and 2 in the haphel (2:38,48). The remaining 26 occurrences are distributed among three nominal forms: 2 occurrences of *šilṭôn* (3:2,3); 14 of *šolṭān* (3:33[4:3]; 4:19[22],31[34; bis]; 6:27[26; bis]; 7:6,12,14[3 times],26,27[bis]), not attested in Biblical Hebrew but the commonest word in Aramaic; and 10 of *šallîṭ* (2:10,15; 4:14,22,23,29[17,25,26,32]; 5:21,29; Ezr. 4:20; 7:24).

3. *Lexical Field.* In Hebrew usage the word family exhibits almost no parallel words. Possible exceptions are Gen. 42:6, if *šallîṭ* is not secondary and *mašbîr,* "the one who sells grain," is not a later addition; and Eccl. 8:8, if *šilṭôn* and *šallîṭ* can really count as parallels. In Biblical Aramaic, however, we find several parallels. In Dnl. 3:2-3 *šilṭôn* appears as a title in a list of high officials of the empire; in 2:10 *šallîṭ* parallels the adj. *raḇ,* referring to the king. Parallel terms are especially common with *šolṭān,* which appears frequently with *malkû,* "kingship, sovereignty" (3:33[4:3]; 4:31[34]; 6:27[26]; 7:14,27]), *rᵉḇû,* "greatness" (4:19[22]; 7:27), and *yᵉqār,* "dignity" (7:14).

In these cases we are probably not dealing with synonyms in the strict sense, but simply with words closely allied to this word family. With respect to the frequently voiced opinion that *šallîṭ* is a synonym of the commoner Hebrew noun → מלך *meleḵ,* "king," considerable caution is in order;[18] the word is closer to Heb. *môšēl,* "ruler."[19] Neither

---

13. According to Mandelkern, 1179, a fem. sg. of *šallîṭ;* also *GesB,* 834; Kautzsch, 88; *BLe,* §61oγ; Meyer, II, §38,6. Wagner, 114, suggests "an independent Heb. form"; cf. *HAL,* II, 1523-24.

14. Wagner, 114.

15. Kautzsch, 88-89.

16. O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (1922), 86*; H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. tr. 1997), 424.

17. Older comms.; also C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (1986), 106.

18. Lohfink, 542.

19. → משׁל *māšal* II; with Lohfink, 541-43.

are there any true antonyms; the closest possibilities are Heb. *sāḵāl,* "fool" (Eccl. 2:19; also 10:6[20]), and *'ᵃḇāḏîm,* "servants" (10:7).[21]

The verb and the nouns are often constructed with prepositions; the variation in usage is somewhat greater in Hebrew than in Aramaic. In Hebrew, *bᵉ* is most common in the sense of ruling "over" (verb: Ps. 119:133; Eccl. 2:19; 8:9; Est. 9:1; noun: Eccl. 8:8), but we also find *'al* in the same sense (Gen. 42:6; Neh. 5:15), as well as a direct personal object followed by *lᵉ* plus an infinitive (Eccl. 5:18[19]; 6:2). Aramaic, however, uses *bᵉ,* "over," almost exclusively, with all the verbal forms (Dnl. 2:38,39; 3:27; 5:7,16; 6:25[24]). An exception is Dnl. 2:48, which uses *'al,* "over." Uniquely among the nouns, *šallîṭ* is constructed with *bᵉ* (4:14,22,29[17,25,32]; 5:21,29; Ezr. 4:20). It also appears with *lᵉ* plus infinitive in Ezr. 7:24.

III. General Usage. Not only the number of occurrences of this word family but also its spectrum of usage is relatively restricted. The latter aspect differentiates further between Hebrew and Aramaic usage. Hebrew usage is largely determined by Ecclesiastes, i.e., by sapiential language, whereas Aramaic usage is determined almost exclusively by Daniel, and hence by eschatological and apocalyptic language.

1. *Hebrew.* In the case of the Hebrew verb, the qal is associated solely with human relationships, the hiphil with theological relationships. Some occurrences of the qal involve individuals (Eccl. 2:19; 8:9), others involve the people as a whole (Est. 9:1; Neh. 5:15). In the case of individual relationships, one text raises the ethical question of how one person exercises authority over another, possibly to the other's hurt (Eccl. 8:9); the other text (2:19) concerns control over one's own possessions, acquired "with toil and wisdom," and in particular with the question of whether they will be inherited by someone who is wise or by a "fool"[22] — probably on the assumption that the latter will squander them. This passage leads into the theological usage of the hiphil; for people's control over the possessions they have acquired is limited, because God has enabled and empowered them to enjoy these good things as God's gift, and their control is therefore totally contingent (5:18[19]; 6:2).[23]

The usage of the nouns can also reflect the element of human limitations: first with respect to the king, whose word is "powerful" *(šilṭôn),* i.e., sovereign, "more powerful" than that of his subjects (Eccl. 8:4); second, because human beings have no power *('ên . . . šallîṭ)* over the wind, i.e., the forces of nature, nor any power *('ên šilṭôn)* over the day of their death (8:8). If *šilṭôn* and *šallîṭ* in these passages are better taken as adjectives than as nouns,[24] then *šalleṭeṯ* ("mighty") in Ezk. 16:30 may well have an almost

20. See *BHK/BHS;* → סכל *skl.*

21. → עבד *'āḇaḏ.*

22. See II.3 above.

23. See IV below.

24. *HAL,* II, 1523, 1524; contra Lisowsky et al.

adverbial function, intensifying the term *'iššâ zônâ,* "whore": "mighty whore," "arch-harlot."[25]

Elsewhere *šallîṭ* is used as a noun, referring to someone with power; a more precise definition is hard to find. In Gen. 42:6 "sovereign" or "governor" might be considered,[26] although here the sense of a superior "administrator" or "steward" is more likely, especially because the same meaning may be present in the much-discussed Eccl. 7:19 — although it is unnecessary to make this meaning dependent on a municipal institution of the Hellenistic period.[27] In Eccl. 10:5, however, the word probably does mean the holder of supreme authority, a "sovereign" responsible for the proper functioning of an ordered society (vv. 6-7).[28]

2. *Aramaic.* In the case of the Aramaic verb, the peal refers to "ruling" in the territorial political sense (Dnl. 2:39) as well as in the personal sense of the exercise of authority by a royal official (5:7,16). In the extended sense it can also denote the "power" of fire (3:27) and wild animals (6:25[24]). The haphel has to do with the bestowal of power and authority on a person, whether the king (2:38) or a high royal official, as in the case of Daniel (2:48).

The usage of nouns corresponds to that of *šilṭôn* (3:2,3) and in part that of *šallîṭ* (2:15; 5:29), denoting a high administrative or military position in the empire under the king; but *šallîṭ* can also denote the great king himself (2:10; also Ezr. 4:20). Several times it is predicated of God or of the "heavens" *(šᵉmayyā')*[29] as a substitute for God (Dnl. 4:14,22,23,29[17,25,26,32]; 5:21). It is also used once in the attenuated sense of "lawful" (Ezr. 7:24). The noun *šolṭān,* peculiar to the Aramaic of Daniel, generally means "dominion" (the one occurrence of the plural [Dnl. 7:26] means "powers/kingdoms"); its usage is typical of doxological style (3:33[4:3]; 4:31[34]; 6:27[26]; 7:14) and has strong eschatological overtones.[30]

IV. Theological Usage. The theological usage and meaning of the word family, both Hebrew and Aramaic, largely accords with its general usage.[31]

The theological meaning of the word in Hebrew usage is associated in the first instance with the historical fate of the people and the battle against their enemies (Est. 9:1; Neh. 5:15; cf. also Gen. 42:6; Ezk. 16:30). This usage appears to be dependent above all on the sapiential thought of Ecclesiastes; this background argues for an association with the theology of an ordered universe (Eccl. 8:8). There may also be a sug-

---

25. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (1979), 328; cf. also Kautzsch, 89-90; J. C. Greenfield, *ErIsr* 16 (1982) 51-56 (Heb.).

26. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 101, 106; also E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* (1964), 318.

27. A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 134; W. Zimmerli, *Prediger. ATD* XVI/1 (1962), 206; *HAL,* II, 1524.

28. Lohfink, 541-42; on the parallelism *meleḵ//šallîṭ* in Eccl. 4:13-16, see G. S. Ogden, *VT* 30 (1980) 309-15, esp. 313.

29. → שָׁמַיִם *šāmayim.*

30. See IV below.

31. See III.1-2 above.

gestion that the power of wisdom is superior to political or (perhaps) military might (7:19).

These sapientially directed statements are largely couched in individual terms (Eccl. 2:19; 5:18[19]; 6:2), but they contain significant references to others. These references reveal the empirically verifiable power structure of an ordered society with a king at its head (8:4; 10:5-7), but they also betray a religious and ethical abhorrence of injustice and oppression (8:9; 10:5; also Neh. 5:15; cf. Ezk. 16:30) as well as a devout and upright attitude (Ps. 119:133). All this is based on the theologically fundamental conviction that human beings as God's creatures are ultimately limited, i.e., that God is the ultimate ground and giver of power and human authority (Eccl. 5:18[19]; 6:2). But when Qoheleth in 6:2 finally calls the human situation "vanity and a grievous ill," a difficult problem of the nature of God rises to the surface.[32]

The particular theological feature of the Aramaic usage of this word family is its predominantly eschatological and apocalyptic character, as noted already.[33] In the usage both of the verb and of the nouns *šilṭôn* and (in part) *šallîṭ,* two factors are expressed: God's compassionate care to protect those who are faithful and righteous (Dnl. 3:27; but cf. 6:25[24]), but above all God's bestowal of power and authority on human beings, so that it is possible to speak of a divinely appointed governance (2:38,48; 3:2,3; 5:7,16,29; also Ezr. 4:20; 7:24). But the theological development goes further, especially when the crucial noun *šolṭān,* "dominion/kingdom," is used. Against the background of the historical collapse of successive kingdoms (Dnl. 2:39),[34] the eschatological end becomes visible: God's "dominion" is manifested in God's "kingdom," in the final apocalyptic battle with other "powers" (in the framework of 3:31–4:34[4:1-37]; cf. 4:14,19,22,23, 29,31[17,22,25,26,32,34]; also 7:6,12,26,27).[35] Just as God is "the living God, enduring forever," so God's "kingdom shall never be destroyed, and his dominion *(šolṭānēh)* will have no end" (6:27[26]), and it is glorified doxologically.[36] All who live must know that "the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of mortals; he gives it to whom he will" (4:14[17]; cf. 4:22,29[25,32]; also 4:23[26]; 5:21; 7:27).[37]

V. 1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The word family is surprisingly infrequent in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The noun *šeleṭ,* "shield," appears in 1QM 6:2. In 11QPs[a] 19:15 (Plea), the psalmist prays that neither Satan nor any unclean spirit may gain power over him *('l tšlṭ by śṭn wrwḥ ṭm'h).* In 4Q252 1 1 (Patriarchal Blessings; 4QpGen[a]), the quotation from Gen. 49:10 is expanded by the addition of *šallîṭ (lw' yswr šlyṭ mšbṭ yhwdh).*[38]

---

32. Lauha, *Kohelet,* 114; R. B. Salters, *ZAW* 91 (1979) 285-89; D. Michel, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet. BZAW* 183 (1989) 138-40.

33. See III.2 above.

34. O. Plöger, *Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 42-57.

35. O. H. Steck, "Weltsgeschehen und Gottesvolk im Buch Daniel," in D. Lührmann and G. Strecker, eds., *Kirche. FS G. Bornkamm* (Tübingen, 1980), 53-78.

36. See III.2 above.

37. Plöger, *Daniel,* 69.

38. J. M. Allegro, *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-76; J. C. Greenfield, in G. B. Sarfatti et al., eds., *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages. FS E. Y. Kutscher* (Ramat Gan, 1980), xxxii-xxxix; *HAL,* II, 1524.

2. *LXX.* The LXX uses several Greek words to represent the relatively few Hebrew and Aramaic occurrences, above all the important word families *exousiázein, exousía* (36 times);[39] *árchein, archḗ, árchōn* (16 times);[40] and *kyrieúein, kýrios* (14 times).[41]

Sæbø

39. W. Förster, *TDNT,* II, 564-66.
40. G. Delling, *TDNT,* I, 481.
41. W. Förster, *TDNT,* III, 1048-56.

שלך *šlk;* שָׁלָךְ *šālāḵ;* שַׁלֶּכֶת *šalleḵeṯ*

I. Ancient Near East: 1. Occurrences and Meaning; 2. Traces in the OT. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. General Usage; 3. Theological Usage; 4. Nouns. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. LXX.

I. Ancient Near East.

1. *Occurrences and Meaning.* The root *šlk* appears in ancient Near Eastern texts with a variety of meanings, none of which corresponds to the basic meaning of Heb. *šlk* hiphil, "throw."

In l. 4 of the inscription of King Mesha of Moab,[1] the root *šlk* appears in a nominal phrase with negative import, the meaning of which can no longer be determined precisely.[2] In a fragmentary Punic inscription from Carthage, *šlk* appears to have the meaning "pay."[3]

We often find *šlk* as a verbal element in theophorous personal names and hypocoristicons in the Phoenician and Punic domain,[4] less often in analogous Aramaic personal names from Egypt.[5] Since the verbal element obviously denotes a salvific act of the deity, the meaning "throw" is inappropriate. In these contexts *šlk* more likely means "save, deliver, provide for."[6]

šlk. M. Cogan, "A Technical Term for Exposure," *JNES* 27 (1968) 133-35; F. Stolz, "שלך *šlk* hi. to throw," *TLOT,* III, 1335-37.

1. *KAI* 181.4.
2. *KAI,* II, 168, 172; III, 24: "assailants"; similarly *TGI*³, 52; *ANET,* 320.
3. R. Dussaud, *Syr* 11 (1930) 202.
4. Benz, 73, 98-100, 148, 174-75, 181; Greek and Latin transcriptions: 416-17.
5. W. Kornfeld, *Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten* (Vienna, 1978), 59, 75.
6. *IPN,* 181 n. 1; *KAI,* II, 66; III, 24; Benz, 416; Tomback, 317-18; Kornfeld, 59, 75.

2. *Traces in the OT.* Dahood claims to have detected this meaning in Ps. 22:11(Eng. 10); 55:23(22); 60:10(8)//108:10(9) and has postulated for these passages the existence of a Hebrew root *šlk* II, "nourish, provide, support, rest."[7] This theory, however, is improbable. In 55:23(22) the structure of the verse is incompatible with the translation of *hašlēḵ* as "your Provider": as in the surrounding verses, the parallelism is more likely synthetic than synonymous. In addition, Dahood postulates an original vocalization *haššōlēḵ*, interprets the article as equivalent to a suffix, understands *yᵉhāḇᵉḵā* as "your Benefactor" *(yōhēḇᵉḵā)*, and reads *ʿal* as the divine epithet "Most High" (counter to the clearly prepositional use of *ʿal* in 22:11[10] and 71:6); this reliance on too many hypothetical assumptions argues against his reinterpretation and translation of v. 23a(22a) as "your Provider is the Most High Yahweh, your Benefactor who will sustain you."[8] In 22:11(10) he[9] translates the expression as "By you have I been nourished from birth."[10] He cites 71:6 as a substantial parallel, but it does not support his argument. Since the roughly synonymous expression *smk* niphal with *ʿal* can hardly mean "support," but rather "rely on," the analogy favors the common view rather than the new interpretation. In 60:10(8)//108:10(9) Dahood interprets *šlk* hiphil as "rest, plant," a translation much too remote from the probable meaning of *šlk* in the Phoenician, Punic, and Aramaic proper names. In all the Psalms passages cited, we may continue to base our interpretation on the basic meaning of Heb. *šlk* hiphil, "throw."[11]

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* In the OT the verb *šlk* occurs only in the hiphil and hophal. Its basic meaning "throw" can take on a wide variety of nuances, depending on the context: "throw away, cast out, discard, toss about, throw out, throw down, throw something over someone, accuse someone of something," and even "reject, surrender."

The verb *šlk* was clearly a common word in everyday language. It appears in both early and late texts, and in all thematic domains of the OT. It is somewhat less common in wisdom texts and does not occur in Proverbs. Its absence from 1 Samuel, Deutero-Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, Hosea, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, Ruth, Song of Songs, and Esther is probably accidental. In the MT *šlk* occurs 112 times in the hiphil and 13 times in the hophal. In Jer. 9:18(19) and Am. 4:3 it would be better to read the hiphil as a hophal, and in Am. 8:3 and Dnl. 8:12 such a revocalization is at least worth considering. In Job 18:7 the form of *šlk* has likely arisen through metathesis; the original reading was probably *wᵉṯaḵšîlēhû*.[12] In Job 29:17 the emendation *ʾešlōp̄* (confusion of *k* and *p*), although not entirely convincing, is worth considering.[13] In 1 K. 9:7, on

7. M. Dahood, *Psalms II. AB* (1968), 37-38, 80.
8. P. 29.
9. P. 38.
10. Contra *Psalms I. AB* (1966), 136.
11. On Job 29:17 see II.2.a below.
12. → כשׁל *kāšal;* see II.3.d below.
13. See II.2.b below.

the other hand, *'ašlîḵ* should be read, with the par. 2 Ch. 7:20 as well as the LXX and other versions.

In most cases *šlk* is constructed with prepositions and other forms indicating the direction or goal, less often with expressions that denote the starting point of the motion. In those texts, not entirely rare, where such circumstantial qualifiers are absent, they can often be supplied from the context. Frequently, however, the absolute sense "throw away" is intended.

2. *General Usage.* a. *Objects.* Battle accounts often mention the throwing of objects. The weapons thrown are unusual, never normal: the millstone with which a woman shatters Abimelech's head (Jgs. 9:53; 2 S. 11:21), the jawbone of a donkey with which Samson kills the Philistines. As a weapon, however, Samson uses the jawbone as a club rather than a projectile. The statement that he threw it away after the battle (Jgs. 15:17) provides a double etymology. The jawbone *(l^eḥî)* explains the toponym *leḥî;* by a wordplay on *šlk* and *rmh* I, the throwing away provides an etiology for the full name *rāmaṯ leḥî.* Thus "Jawbone Hill," apparently so called on account of its topographical situation, is explained as the "Place Where the Jawbone Was Thrown Away."[14]

A garment is thrown over a dying commander to keep the advancing army from stopping to stare (2 S. 20:12). An invading army lays waste the territory of an enemy by destroying its cities, stopping up its wells, felling its groves, and covering its fields with stones (2 K. 3:25), ruining (*k'b* hiphil, v. 19) the arable land and preventing its normal use. Soldiers in hasty flight often throw away garments and weapons, as the Arameans do in 2 K. 7:15. The panic among the Arameans is ascribed to a hallucination brought about by Yahweh (vv. 6-7); thus this text has affinities with the traditions of the wars of Yahweh.

These affinities are even clearer in Josh. 10:11, which says that Yahweh threw down huge stones from heaven on the enemies of Israel: here Yahweh is the actual subject doing the throwing.[15] Finally, Ps. 2:3 is also related thematically to the war narratives. Using poetic language, the psalmist conjures up a revolt of the nations against the sovereign dominion of the king of Jerusalem (vv. 1-3). He quotes their statement of the rebellion's goal: casting off the bonds of foreign rule (*šlk* hiphil par. *ntq* piel, "burst"). The presumed hegemony of Judah over the nations (cf. v. 8) can hardly correspond to reality; it reflects the royal ideology of the surrounding world.

The use of *šlk* is also common in legal and cultic ordinances. An object hurled at someone, deliberately or accidentally, can be fatal (Nu. 35:20,22; cf. Jgs. 9:53). The flesh of an animal torn by wild animals and left on the ground must not be eaten (Lev. 7:24; 17:15; 22:8) but must be thrown to the dogs (Ex. 22:30[31]). The stones of a house that bear evidence of "leprosy" (mold, lichen, etc.) are to be taken out under the supervision of a priest and thrown into an unclean place (Lev. 14:40). The purpose in both cases is elimination of uncleanness. Similarly, the crop of a sacrificial bird must

14. See already H. Gressmann, *Die Anfange Israels. SAT* I/2 (1922), 241, 254.
15. See II.3.b below.

not be burned on the altar but must be removed and thrown on the refuse heap (Lev. 1:16). On the other hand, priestly tasks also include throwing purifying materials on the fire in the preparation of water for cleansing (Nu. 19:6) and throwing salt on the offerings (Ezk. 43:24).

The throwing of an object plays a special role in miracle stories that appear in the Moses and Elisha traditions, in addition to other elements that suggest a relationship between the two traditions.[16] The staff of Moses (in the version of the JE redaction [Ex. 4:3]) or of Aaron (in the P version [Ex. 7:9-10,12]) turns into a serpent when thrown on the ground.[17] In the former case, the purpose is to awaken faith, in the latter, to provide a demonstration of power in Pharaoh's presence. A piece of wood thrown into the water makes a bitter spring potable (Ex. 15:25); by the same action, Elisha makes an ax head that had fallen into the Jordan float (2 K. 6:6). By throwing his mantle over Elisha, Elijah makes him his servant (1 K. 19:19). By throwing in salt, Elisha "heals" the water of the spring at Jericho (2 K. 2:21); by throwing flour into the pot, he makes a bitter, inedible dish edible (4:41). Among these miracle stories, the most imposing is the anecdote describing how a dead man thrown into the grave of Elisha[18] is restored to life by contact with Elisha's bones (13:21).

The vb. *šlk* occurs several times in the tradition of the golden calf. To make this image, Aaron throws the gold of the Israelites into the fire (Ex. 32:24; cf. Gideon's manufacture of the ephod in Jgs. 8:25, although here the rings taken as booty are thrown onto a garment). Enraged over the image of the calf, Moses throws the two tablets out of his hands and they are broken (Ex. 32:19; Dt. 9:17). According to Dt. 9:21, Moses throws the dust of the pulverized image into the stream (a different version is told in Ex. 32:20).

In prophetic texts *šlk* in conjunction with objects appears in many contexts. When Jehoiakim throws the pieces cut off from Jeremiah's scroll into the fire (Jer. 36:23), he is clearly trying to destroy the baneful power of the prophet's words. Conversely, the throwing of the scroll into the Euphrates in 51:63 is intended to seal the effect of the spoken words and hence the definitive downfall of Babylon. In 7:29 the cutting off and throwing away of hair introduces a lament; in Ezk. 5:4, where the hair is to be thrown into the fire, it is part of a symbolic action. The flinging away of silver (Ezk. 7:19) is a topos of judgment, as is the casting down of dwellings (Jer. 9:18[19]). The people "who cast hooks in the Nile" are the Egyptian fishermen (Isa. 19:8). In a literary imitation of a prophetic symbolic actions (Zec. 11:4-14), the prophet throws his wages into the temple treasury to be melted down (v. 13) as a vivid symbol of the low esteem God enjoys among his people.

In wisdom contexts the use of *šlk* with objects is rare. Job 15:33 compares the fate of the wicked *(rāšā')* to an olive tree that casts off its blossoms. The subject of 27:22 is likewise the bad end awaiting the wicked, but here the subject and object of the action

---

16. L. Perlitt, *EvT* 31 (1971) 588-608.

17. On the literary analysis of and the relationship between the two versions, see W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 192-97.

18. See II.2.c below.

are obscure. The meaning may be that the east wind (v. 21) hurls sand and stones at the wicked.[19] In 29:14-17 Job avows that he has been on the side of the poor and the afflicted, and torn *(šlk)* the prey from the teeth of the unrighteous (v. 17). Here the author may be using *šlk* in poetic hyperbole ("throw" = "tear"). The emendation *'ešlōp̱* may be considered, but it would represent a singular usage, since all the textually secure instances of *šlp* in the sense of "draw out, draw off" involve the sword or sandals as the object. Also singular would be the hypothesis, based on Arabic, of a root *šlk* II, "tear out."[20] A philologically satisfactory explanation is not (yet) possible, but the meaning "tear out, draw out" is assured by the context (and LXX *ekspán*).

Finally, Eccl. 3:5 contrasts "a time for throwing away *(šlk)*" with "a time for keeping *(šmr)*." Only in the account of the apportionment of the land in Josh. 18:1ff. does *šlk* appear in the expression "cast lots" (vv. 8,10), an action represented more commonly by *npl* hiphil or *ydd* (and in 18:6 by *yrh*). A land survey and distribution is also the subject of Mic. 2:5 (probably secondary), which appears to envision the casting of a measuring line *(ḥeḇel)* on a piece of real estate (*gôrāl* in the sense of "allotment, plot").[21]

Finally, *šlk* is used metaphorically in Jgs. 9:17. The text does not mean that Jotham's father "threw away" his life in the strict sense, but that he "risked" it.

b. *Human Beings.* When someone "throws" another living person, it is usually to cause their death. Both Joseph (Gen. 37:20,22,24) and Jeremiah (Jer. 38:6,9) are to be gotten rid of by being thrown into a cistern. The same holds true of the newborn males of the Israelites, whom Pharaoh orders to be thrown into the Nile to stop the increase of Israel (Ex. 1:22). A brutal mass murder by throwing the victims from the top of a rock is recorded in 2 Ch. 25:12. Ezk. 16:5 is thinking of the exposure of newborn females in the open field — a practice still found today among Arab bedouin.

The action in Gen. 21:15 has a different accent: Hagar throws her son under a bush because she cannot bear to witness his death. It is here and in Ezk. 16:5 that the meaning "surrender, expose" is clearest, although these texts provide too narrow a base to claim a "technical term of exposure."[22] Job 18:7 states that "the wicked are overthrown by their own schemes." The meaning "overthrow" would be unique to this passage,[23] but it is probably better to assume that the text is corrupt and read *wᵉṯaḵšilēhû*, "cause to stumble."

c. *Corpses.* When corpses are cast out, we are dealing in the first instance with an exceptional form of burial, as in the case of the king of Ai (Josh. 8:29), the five Canaanite

---

19. A. Weiser, *Hiob. ATD* XIII (⁵1988), 193, 196; G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 387-88.

20. G. R. Driver, *AJSL* 52 (1935/36) 163; idem, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Job," in M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas, eds., *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 85; Zorell, *LexHebAram*, 852; see also the meaning of *šlk* in the texts cited in I.1 above.

21. On the interpretation of the context see (among others) A. Alt, *KlSchr*, III (1959), 373-81, assuming the unity of the passage; and H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 67-80, assuming the contrary.

22. Cogan.

23. Stolz, 1336.

kings (10:27), and Absalom (2 S. 18:17). Each account speaks of piling large stones over the burial place. Jer. 26:23 probably means that the body of the prophet Uriah was buried hastily and contemptuously in the cemetery of the common people.

In other instances casting out bodies means that they are denied proper burial (cf. Jer. 41:9). This is the case in Jeremiah's oracle about the end of Jehoiakim, which appears in two versions (22:19//36:30b) that clearly derive from a single original. It is here foretold that Jehoiakim will not be mourned and buried in the normal way. This prophecy was not fulfilled (2 K. 24:6). In both Am. 8:3 and Jer. 14:16, cast-out corpses vividly symbolize the extent of the coming catastrophe: the number of dead will be so great that it is no longer possible to bury them. A similar prophecy, this time referring to all the nations, appears in Isa. 34:3, while 14:19 (emended) foretells that the "king of Babylon" will be cast out without burial.

The intention revealed in 1 K. 13:24,25,28 is different. The scenario of the man of God killed by a lion and thrown in the road, with both the donkey and the lion standing beside it, highlights the miraculous nature of Yahweh's action. Even more miraculous is the brief account of dead man thrown into the grave of Elisha, who is restored to life when he touches the prophet's bones (2 K. 13:21).

In 2 K. 9:25-26 Jehu orders that the body of the slain king Joram be thrown on the plot of ground belonging to Naboth in order to fulfill a prophetic oracle (v. 26; clearly a special tradition concerning the events described in 1 K. 21), even though this oracle concerned Ahab personally and not his son. In 2 K. 10:25, finally, the bodies of the slain worshipers of Baal are cast aside. The corrupt text prevents us from understanding the precise nuance of the expression and the exact circumstances. In 2 S. 20:21-22 the head of Sheba is thrown over the wall to Joab to prove that the rebel is dead.

d. *Idols.* A relatively small number of texts use *šlk* in connection with the removal of idols. Though few, these texts have particular significance, for they are concerned not only with the suppression of foreign cult symbols but above all with the alteration of religious practice: dissociation from foreign gods and undivided devotion to Yahweh. This situation is especially clear in Ezk. 20:7, which recalls God's command that the generation of Egypt cast away foreign gods — a command that they disobey (v. 8). Isa. 2:20 foretells that people will throw away their idols because they have no power to save but only burden those who are fleeing from the terrible power of Yahweh.

The other occurrences appear in accounts of cultic reform: Josiah orders the dust of the destroyed Asherah image thrown upon the graves of the common people (2 K. 23:6; cf. Jer. 26:23) and the rubble of the altars on the roofs thrown into the Kidron (2 K. 23:12). The content of 2 K. 23:12 is repeated in 2 Ch. 30:14, although here associated with the time of Hezekiah. Manasseh, too, is said to have undertaken a cultic reform (2 Ch. 33:15-16), in which the idols and their altars were destroyed and their remnants thrown out of the city (v. 15). Related to these actions is Nehemiah's throwing of the Ammonite Tobiah and his household goods out of a room in the temple precincts, which had been desecrated through use by a foreigner (Neh. 13:8).

3. *Theological Usage.* a. *Yahweh and Israel.* Used in connection with Yahweh, *šlk* often has a metaphorical sense, with a variety of nuances. Relatively rarely are we told

that Israel or its representatives "discarded" Yahweh. The Dtr verse 1 K. 14:9 accuses Jeroboam of having thrust Yahweh "behind his back," meaning that he has slighted or even disdained Yahweh and turned to other gods. Ezk. 23:35 accuses Oholibah (= Jerusalem) of doing the same. Here the idiom "cast behind one's back" appears in conjunction with *škḥ*, "forget." It appears once more in Neh. 9:26, which confesses that the ancestors disobeyed the law, and finally in 4QpHos[a] 2:4 and (with the opposite signification) in Isa. 38:17. Speaking for God, Ps. 50:17 accuses the wicked of casting God's words "behind him," i.e., disregarding them. Here we probably have an abbreviated form of the idiom "throw behind one's back."

Much more frequently we read that Yahweh "casts out" Israel or Judah and Jerusalem. Several texts exhibiting Dtr composition or influence speak of Yahweh as casting out his people "from his presence" (2 K. 17:20; 24:20//Jer. 52:3; Jer. 7:15) or forbearing to do so (2 K. 13:23). All these texts were formulated after 587 B.C.E. and speak retrospectively. "Casting out" from Yahweh's presence means banishment from the promised land, deportation. This meaning is clear in Jer. 7:15, which compares the fate of the inhabitants of Jerusalem of Judah to what befell the northern Israelites (in 722 B.C.E.). The Dtr explanation of God's judgment in Dt. 29:27(28) says explicitly that Yahweh uprooted *(ntš)* the Israelites (= Judahites) from their land and cast them into another land, "as is now the case." The first group of texts, which speak of casting out from Yahweh's presence, explicate the consequences of God's judgment in 587 even more pointedly: the deportations, here generalized to include the entire people, mean not just expulsion from their homeland, conveyed to them by God, but also banishment from Yahweh's presence to the unclean, pagan land of the enemy, where God is far away.

In Dtr thought deprivation of the land and of Yahweh's presence goes hand in hand with loss of the temple. In 1 K. 9:7 (cj.)//2 Ch. 7:20, for example, Solomon is warned that Yahweh will "cast out of his presence" the house that he has consecrated for his name. This Dtr set piece refers to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.

Two further texts, with a pre-Dtr core, use *šlk* as a term for deportation. Although they do not name Yahweh explicitly as the subject of the verb, they presuppose that he is the initiator of the action: Am. 4:3 (cj. hophal), which describes the train of prisoners that includes the upper-class women of Samaria; and Jer. 22:28 (*šlk* hophal par. *ṭwl* hophal), which alludes to the deportation of Jehoiachin in 597. The events of 597 are also the subject of Lam. 2:1, which in metaphorical if not outright mythological language laments that Yahweh has "thrown down from heaven to earth the splendor of Israel," i.e., Jerusalem-Zion.

b. *Yahweh and the Nations.* When *šlk* with Yahweh as subject has foreign nations or their representatives as its object, a victory or deliverance of Israel is often involved. This is the case in the early period when Yahweh throws down stones on the Canaanites (Josh. 10:11)[24] and also when he pelts Nineveh with filth (Nah. 3:6); the latter act implies the fall of the city, the collapse of the Assyrian Empire, and the libera-

24. See III.2.a above.

tion of the subject nations. Neh. 9:11 refers retrospectively to the deliverance of Israel at the Sea of Reeds; Ezk. 28:17 proleptically laments the fall of the king of Tyre, using the image of the primal man cast down from the mountain of God, without making any direct reference to the simultaneous fate of Judah.

Quite different in nature are the words spoken by God in Ps. 60:8-10(6-8)//108:8-10(7-9). Here Yahweh's declaration that he hurls his shoe on Edom (v. 10[8/9]) is probably based on a ritual used in taking possession of land.[25]

c. *Yahweh and the Individual.* Statements using *šlk* for actions involving Yahweh and an individual occur almost exclusively in the Psalter. The verb is always used as a poetic metaphor. The psalmist's words of trust in Ps. 22:11(10), "on you I was cast [hophal] from the womb," express lifelong dependence and reliance on God. The words of encouragement in 55:23(22), "cast your burden [the meaning of the hapax legomenon *yᵉhāḇ*[26]] on Yahweh," i.e., "entrust it to him, leave it to him," inspire an attitude of trust on the part of the psalmist.[27]

The lament that Yahweh has thrown the psalmist aside (Ps. 102:11[10], *šlk* with *nś'*) or cast him into the midst of the sea (Jon. 2:4[3]) appears in descriptions of affliction. Finally, the verb also appears in petitions: "do not cast me away from your saving presence" (Ps. 51:13[11]), "do not cast me off in the time of old age" (71:9, *šlk* par. *'zb*).

d. *Yahweh and Sin.* The statement that Yahweh "casts away" sin, i.e., disregards or forgives it, appears in a few texts that employ psalmic language but stand outside the Psalter. In the so-called Psalm of Hezekiah (Isa. 38:17), the speaker expresses certain confidence in Yahweh: "You have cast all my sins *(ḥᵃṭā'āy)* behind your back."[28] In Mic. 7:19, similarly, the congregation expresses its confidence in Yahweh: "You will cast all our sins *(ḥaṭṭō'ṯēnû)* into the depths of the sea." In Ezk. 18:31, conversely, in an appeal to repentance, Yahweh entreats the Judahites to cast away their transgression *(pᵉšā'îm)*. This call to new obedience is to lead to a new heart and a new spirit.

e. *Other.* Some passages with Yahweh or his representatives as subject use *šlk* in the literal sense. In 2 K. 2:16 the company of prophets think that the spirit-wind *(rûaḥ)* of Yahweh has caught up Elijah and thrown him down onto some mountain or into a valley. The verse appears in a secondary addition to the original narrative, which (unlike the addition) was interested not primarily in the legitimacy of Elisha as Elijah's successor but in the reality of Elijah's ascension. In one of Zechariah's night visions (Zec. 5:5-11), the interpreting angel thrusts the woman embodying wickedness back into the basket and throws a leaden weight down on its mouth (v. 8) — an action intended in its entirety to symbolize the cleansing of the early Jewish community from sin. In a hymnic glorification of God, Ps. 147:17 ascribes the hail during Palestine's wintry rainy season to Yahweh and his word.

---

25. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 257-58; for a different interpretation see I.2 above.

26. *HAL*, I, 393.

27. For a totally different interpretation of Ps. 22:11(10); 55:23(22), see I.2 above.

28. For a discussion of this expression see II.3.a above.

The verb *šlk* appears several times in Dnl. 8:7-12, which presents a vision representing the entanglements of the Jerusalem community in the period from the 4th to the 2d century B.C.E. The male goat that throws the ram down to the ground and tramples on it is Alexander the Great, who overthrew the Persian Empire (v. 7). Vv. 11-12 begin to approach the present: they refer to the suppression of the Jewish religion by the Seleucid Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who put an end to the daily offering, desecrated the temple (hophal, v. 11), and "cast truth to the ground" (v. 12), i.e., prohibited the practice of the Jewish religion.

4. *Nouns.* The connection of the nouns *šālāḵ* and *šalleḵeṯ* with the root *šlk* is uncertain. The former appears in Lev. 11:17 and Dt. 14:17 in lists of birds that must not be eaten. The exact species referred to, however, is unknown (diving pelican? cormorant? fishing owl?). The theory that the name reflects the way the bird stoops to catch fish[29] may be considered, but is far from certain. This uncertainty is even greater in the case of *šalleḵeṯ,* the name of the western gate of the temple in 1 Ch. 26:16. That it refers to a gate "that initially probably opened on an area where ashes, etc., were *thrown out*"[30] is an improbable guess, since such a gate would compete with the "Dung Gate." In Isa. 6:13, however, *šalleḵeṯ* is undoubtedly connected with the root *šlk,* since this text has to do with the "throwing down" (= "felling") of trees.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šlk* appears only in the hiphil. In 1QM 6:1; 8:1,12, it refers to the hurling of weapons, in 4QM[a] 14-15 9 to the throwing of corpses. To the extent that it is possible to understand the fragmentary context, in 1QH 17:15 the poet (in language that recalls Isa. 38:17) expects God to "cast off" the transgressions of the faithful, i.e., to disregard them (cf. 4Q504 1-2 6:2).[31] Commenting on Hos. 2:10(8), 4QpHos[a] accuses the Israelites of having cast God's commandments behind their backs (cf. Neh. 9:26).[32]

IV. LXX. In the vast majority of cases, the LXX translates *šlk* with *rhíptein* and its compounds *apo-, ek-, epi-, katarríptein,* much less frequently with *bállein* and its compounds *ek-* and *embállein.* Only once or twice is *šlk* translated or paraphrased by *apostréphein, ekpíptein, ekteínein, ekphérein, erēmoún, kathiénai, katakrēmnízein, katarássein,* or *sphállein.*

Thiel

29. *GesB,* 835; König, 505.
30. König, 505.
31. See also II.3.d above.
32. See also II.3.a above.

שָׁלַל *šālal* → בזז *bzz*

שָׁלֵם *šālēm*

I. Ancient Near East. II. 1. Etymology; Basic Meaning; 2. Occurrences. III. Verb: 1. Qal; 2. Piel; 3. Pual; 4. Hiphil; 5. Hophal. IV. Adjective: 1. Intact; 2. Full; 3. Whole; Peaceable. V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Ancient Near East. The root is Common Semitic. It basic meaning is usually taken to be "peace," but "wholeness" has also been suggested. In the Ras Shamra texts, the meanings "be well, have peace, keep, pay" are attested. The noun usually means "peace," but it is also used as a sacrificial term (cf. *šelem, šᵉlāmîm*). It appears also as a divine name *(šalim)* and as a toponym or anthroponym.[1] In Akkadian the root exhibits a great wealth of forms and nuances;[2] here the meaning "totality" or "wholeness" is usually assumed for the substantival forms. The verb *šalāmu* has a wide range of usage in Akkadian. The basic meaning of the G stem is usually given as "be whole, be in order," with the D stem meaning "make whole."[3] The root also occurs in many forms in extrabiblical Hebrew, epigraphic Aramaic, the Elephantine papyri, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic.[4]

II. 1. *Etymology; Basic Meaning.* Torczyner's attempt to derive the root from *šlh,* "be calm, at ease," via *šālôm* has found little acceptance.[5] Debate over the so-called ba-

---

šālēm. H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970), esp. 134, 149; W. Caspari, *Vorstellung und Wort "Friede" im AT. BFCT* 14/4 (1910); W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel* שלם *im AT. BZAW* 113 (1969); G. Gerleman, "Die Wurzel *šlm,*" *ZAW* 85 (1973) 1-14; idem, "שלם *šlm* to have enough," *TLOT,* III, 1337-48; P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. Münsterschwarzacher Studien* 13 (1971), esp. 211-13; K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *ZTK* 52 (1955) 1-42 = idem, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des AT. WdF* 125 (1972), 130-80; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 209; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971); D. J. McCarthy, "Ebla, ὅρκια τέμνειν, *ṭb, šlm,*" *Bibl* 60 (1979) 247-53; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, 263-335; L. Prijs, "Ergänzungen zum talmudisch-hebräischen Wörterbuch," *ZDMG* 120 (1970) 6-29, esp. 27-28; G. Rinaldi, "*šlm* hi.," *BeO* 13 (1971) 233; J. Scharbert, "ŠLM im AT," in H. Gross and F. Mussner, eds., *Lex tua veritas. FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 209-29 = K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip. WdF* 125 (1972), 300-324; F. L. Shuts, "שלם and תמם in Biblical Hebrew" (diss., Austin, 1974).

1. *UT,* no. 2424; *WUS,* no. 2614; Eisenbeis, 8-10.
2. *AHw,* II, 1013-14, 1015-16.
3. Eisenbeis, 13-34.
4. → שלום *šālôm.*
5. H. Torczyner, *Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus,* I (Vienna, 1916), 243.

sic meaning continues to this day. Following Caspari and especially Pedersen,[6] scholars generally assume that root denotes "totality, wholeness."[7] Gerleman considers this theory an unfortunate consequence of taking *šālôm* rather than the intensive form of the verb as a starting point.[8] In his view the intensive means "pay"; he proposes the meaning "have enough" for the root.

2. *Occurrences.* The occurrences in the MT are distributed as follows: the verb occurs 8 times in the qal (Mandelkern treats *šālēm* in Gen. 15:16 as a verb;[9] it is usually considered an adjective, as here), 89 times in the piel, 5 times in the pual, 13 times in the hiphil, and once in the hophal; the adjective occurs 28 times. Thus the lemma covers a total of 144 occurrences.

In Ps. 55:21(Eng. 20) the plural form of *šālôm* in the MT can hardly be correct; it should be emended to the act. ptcp. *bᵉšōlᵉmô,* "against his friend."[10] In Job 41:3(11), instead of the piel we should probably read the qal *wayyišlām,* "and remain safe."[11] If these emendations are accepted, the occurrences of the qal rise to 10 and those of the piel drop to 88; the total number of occurrences rises to 145.

III. Verb.

1. *Qal.* The verb appears in the qal with several meanings:

a. In Isa. 60:20 it means "be ended": Jerusalem's "days of mourning" are over.

b. In three passages it means "be completed, finished": 1 K. 7:51; 2 Ch. 5:1 (Solomon's work of building the temple); Neh. 6:15 (the city wall of Jerusalem).

c. The active participle means "be at peace with, be a friend of" (Job 22:21), in contrast to *ṣôrēr,* "oppressor" (Ps. 7:5[4]). In the latter text, Eisenbeis sees an emphasis on the "circumstance of totality" and understands the participle as "being associated with a member of the covenant people."[12] Others have proposed reading a piel instead of the qal participle.[13] This emendation is unnecessary: the MT may be read quite straightforwardly as contrasting "friend" and "foe." The passive participle, "peaceable," describes a city in 2 S. 20:19. The qal imperative appears in Job 22:21 with the meaning "be at peace with."

d. The imperfect occurs in Job 9:4 in the sense of "remain safe and sound" or "succeed." The conjectural substitution of a perfect for the subst. *šālôm* in Job 21:9[14] does not appear to be well founded.[15] Better grounded is the proposed reading *wayyišlām,* "and remain safe," in Job 41:3(11).[16]

---

6. Pp. 263-64.
7. Also Eisenbeis, 353.
8. "Wurzel *šlm,*" 1-2.
9. Mandelkern, 1180.
10. See, e.g., *BHS;* H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 518-19; Eisenbeis, 67.
11. *HAL,* II, 1533; G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 527; cf. NRSV.
12. P. 298.
13. E.g., *KBL*², 979; not repeated in *HAL,* II, 1533.
14. *KBL*², 979.
15. Eisenbeis, 68; Fohrer, *Hiob,* 133, 337. Here too *HAL,* II, ³, 1508, retains the MT.
16. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 527; but cf. Eisenbeis, 77-78.

Gerleman's attempt to find the meaning "have satisfaction, have enough, be satisfied," negatively "bear requital (punishment), make amends,"[17] in all occurrences of the qal seems rather forced.

2. *Piel.* The occurrences of the piel totally dominate the overall picture of the verb. We shall distinguish the following meanings: (a) "make restitution," (b) "recompense," (c) "pay a vow," (d) "restore," and (e) "finish."[18] Eisenbeis organizes the material on the basis of the sources.[19] Gerleman again takes the piel as the starting point for his study of the root.[20]

a. *Make Restitution.* The Covenant Code uses the piel as a technical term in a series of legal precepts. These are formulated casuistically, with one or more conditional clauses followed by an apodosis stating punishment entailed. The *šlm* forms appear in the apodosis describing the punishment or the restitution to be made. According to Daube,[21] *šillēm* originally meant "restitution in kind, not in money." In the Covenant Code restitution in money stands side by side with restitution in kind, e.g., return of stolen goods (cf., e.g., Ex. 21:34, "he shall make restitution giving money," and v. 36, "ox for ox"). In four instances the imperfect is reinforced by a preceding infinitive absolute (*šallēm yᵉšallēm,* Ex. 31:36; 22:2,5,13[3,6,14]); this expression means "he must make full restitution." Boecker, by contrast, prefers to consider the simple expression as an "attenuation of the form" (Ex. 21:34,37; 22:4b,6,8[5b,7,9]).[22] Liedke proposes yet a different analysis, viewing simple *yᵉšallēm* as an "optative present," standard usage in oral jurisprudence.[23] Double restitution is required by Ex. 22:6,8(7,9); cf. the fourfold restitution in 2 S. 12:6.[24]

These precepts deal with indemnification; the use the term *šillēm* in the Covenant Code is limited to precepts in the realm of property law. As a general rule, the damage is to be paid in full. Three cases are named in which no restitution need be made (Ex. 22:10,12,14[11,13,15]). Precepts dealing with restitution are also found in Lev. 5 and 24. Lev. 5:16 deals with indemnification of the temple for errors in sacrificial offerings. Restitution is to equal the amount of the damage plus a fifth, to be given to the priest. A similar requirement is stated in 5:24(6:5), in the case of someone who has acquired property illegally: full restitution plus a fifth. Finally, 24:18 and 21 deal with two cases in which someone kills an animal belonging to someone else: full restitution is to made, according to the talion principle.[25]

In some cases the prep. *taḥaṯ* introduces the object for which restitution is made

17. *TLOT,* III, 1341-42.
18. Following *HAL,* II, 1534-35.
19. Pp. 301-25.
20. "Wurzel *šlm,*" 4-5.
21. D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (1947), 134-41.
22. P. 149.
23. P. 43.
24. See below.
25. Eisenbeis, 303, 306-8.

(Ex. 21:36) or what is "requited" (Gen. 44:4; Ps. 38:21[20]).[26] Once the object "debt" is expressed by the noun *nešek*. A proverb states: "The wicked borrow, and do not pay back *(w^elō' y^ešallēm),* but the righteous are generous and keep giving" (Ps. 37:21).

In 2 S. 12:6 the need for restitution is stated by King David: the rich man, whom Nathan has described in his story as having taken the little ewe lamb of the poor man, is condemned to death and must also restore the lamb fourfold. In 2 K. 4:7 the debt of a woman is repaid with the money she receives from selling the oil miraculously provided by the prophet Elisha. In Prov. 22:27 the infinitive means "(re)pay"; in Prov. 6:31 and Ezk. 33:15 the imperfect means "restore, give back" stolen property.

According to Isa. 57:18, God repays the afflicted with comfort. In Joel 2:25 God promises to replace the damage done to the harvest by locusts.

b. *Repay.* The idea of "repayment" or "retribution" is based on the correspondence of actions and consequences. Koch does not believe that this idea is present in the OT. The vb. *šillēm,* he says, means instead that an action is "completed," so that actions determine their own outcome. "All OT traditions connect this sin-disaster or good action–blessing dependency with Yahweh's activity. Yahweh effects these dependencies by making the action operative on the person of the agent, bringing it back upon him and completing it (השׁיב, פקד, שׁלם). Yahweh's participation in the good action–blessing dependency is much more critical than in its opposite."[27] Despite this very important corrective introduced by Koch, in the remainder of this discussion we shall use the term "repay" in quotation marks, representing both positive reward and negative retribution, to distinguish this use of the piel from that described in (e) below.

In Dt. 7:10 Yahweh himself is called "the repayer" (ptcp.), who will not delay in repaying those who hate him (cf. 5:9). In 2 S. 3:39 David voices the wish that Yahweh will "repay" the murderers of Abner in accordance with their wickedness. In 1 S. 24:20 and Ruth 2:12, the contrary wish is expressed: Yahweh is expected to "repay" (NRSV: reward) Ruth for what she has done. According to the MT of Prov. 13:21, God is the subject who rewards the righteous. Prov. 19:17 states that God "repays" kindness shown to the poor; the verse speaks of such an action as a loan to God. Prov. 25:22 says that someone who shows kindness to enemies, giving them bread and water, "heaps coals of fire on their heads" — again, God will "repay" the doer.

Can mortals be "repayers" *(m^ešall^emîm)* of God? Joel 4:4(3:4) asks this question rhetorically with respect to Tyre, Sidon, and Philistia. The notion is immediately rejected as nonsense: God will turn their deeds back upon their own heads (here forms of → גמל *gāmal* are juxtaposed with *šlm*). The perfective form *w^ešillēm* in Dt. 32:35 should probably be read as a 1st person sg. impf.: *'^ašallēm.*[28] Here "vengeance" is equated with "repayment": both belong to God (cf. also v. 41). In Jgs. 1:7 a foreign king expects to be "repaid" by God; in 2 K. 9:26 divine "repayment" of King Ahab for murdering Naboth is foretold through the mouth of a prophet. Ps. 31:24(23) describes

26. See III.2.b below.
27. P. 31.
28. *HAL,* II, 1535; *BHS.*

God as "repaying" the haughty, while 62:13(12) says that God "repays" all according to their work. This view is shared by Job's friend Elihu (Job 34:11), whose statement of the so-called doctrine of retribution is classic: "For according to their deeds [God] will repay them, and according to their ways he will make it befall them." He then asks Job whether, in his opinion, God should "pay back" a penitent sinner, because Job has rejected God's judgment (v. 33). In Job 21:19,31, the leading speaker questions whether God or anyone else "repays" the wicked as they deserve — i.e., here "the concept of actions with built-in consequences was shaken to the foundation, but this concept was not radically transformed by being replaced by some other basic construct."[29]

In late recensions of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the motif of the divine "repayer" appears several times. Those "repaid" are collectives, not individuals as in wisdom literature. Jer. 51:6,24,56 say that Yahweh will "repay" Babylon. According to Isa. 59:18; 66:6, he will "repay" his enemies. In Isa. 65:6 and Jer. 32:18ff. it is Israel that is "repaid"; here the iniquities of their ancestors are included (cf. Dt. 7:10). In Jer. 16:18 and 25:14 Yahweh uses foreign nations to repay Israel for its idolatry. In Jer. 50:29, conversely, Israel is summoned as God's instrument to "repay" Babylon, which has impugned the majesty of Yahweh. Ps. 137:8 blesses whoever takes vengeance on Babylon *(šeyᵉšallēm/'eṯ-gᵉmûlēḵ šeggāmalt).* The question of whether one should "repay" is frequently discussed. Prov. 20:22 cautions against "repaying" evil: it is better to wait for God's help. In Ps. 41:11(10), however, the psalmist says: "But you, Yahweh, be gracious to me, and raise me up, that I may repay them."

In Gen. 44:4 Joseph's brothers, who allegedly have stolen Joseph's silver cup, are asked: "Why have you repaid good with evil?" In Ps. 35:12 and 38:21(20), the psalmist's enemies are charged with the same unnatural behavior. In these cases we are dealing with a reversal of the actions-consequences construct.

c. *Pay a Vow.* The use of *šillēm* in the sense of "pay a vow" turns it into a technical term. Only one narrative text (2 S. 15:7) speaks of going to a cultic site to pay a vow. The temple is the place where vows are paid (Ps. 22:26[25]; 50:14; 56:13[12]; 61:9[8]; 66:13; 76:12[11]; 116:14,18). The Psalm of Jonah also connects payment vows with the sacrificial cult (Jon. 2:10[9]). The last speech of Eliphaz to Job treats the sequence prayer — favorable hearing — payment of the vow as almost automatic: "If you pray to him, he will hear you, and you will pay your vow" (Job 22:27).

Israel must not postpone paying its vow to Yahweh (Dt. 23:22[21]). Qoheleth cautions that it is better not to vow than to make a vow and fail to pay it (Eccl. 5:3-4[4-5]). In Prov. 7:14 the temptress says, "I had to offer sacrifices, and today I have paid my vows *(šillamtî nᵉḏārāy),*" which probably involves a play on words *(šᵉlāmîm/šillamtî).*

In prophetic literature the future is expected to bring payment of vows. In Hos. 14:3(2) the prophet demands that the people return to Yahweh and pay him "an offering of our lips," i.e., praise. Isa. 19:21 declares that in the future the Egyptians will

29. Koch, 36.

know Yahweh and serve him, i.e., they will bring all offerings before him, including the payment of vows. Good news is proclaimed to Judah: "Celebrate your festivals, O Judah, pay your vows" (Nah. 2:1[1:15]).

d. *Restore.* The meaning "restore" is found in Job 8:6. Bildad says that Job will have his dwelling place *(nāweh)* restored (or preserved) by Yahweh if he is "pure and upright," i.e., either morally blameless (a gloss explicating v. 5?[30]) or qualified to participate in the cult.[31]

e. *Complete.* In 1 K. 9:25, finally, the perfective form is used to say that Solomon "completed the house [the temple]."[32]

3. *Pual.* Of the few occurrences of the pual, one is the passive equivalent of the piel in the sense of "repay."[33] Jeremiah asks in sorrow, "Is evil a recompense for good?" (Jer. 18:20; cf. Gen. 44:4). Prov. 11:31, too, reflects the "doctrine of retribution": "Surely the righteous are repaid on earth." The same idea appears in Prov. 13:13 if the MT is retained (cf. v. 21 and many other texts). A counterpart to the meaning "pay a vow"[34] appears in Ps. 65:2(1): praise is due to Yahweh, and to him "vows are paid." Isa. 42:19 is a *crux interpretum:* the MT is vocalized as *kimšullām,* a pual participle. Perhaps the best suggestion is that of Elliger,[35] who proposes reading the qal ptcp. *mōšᵉlîm,* "maker of parables" (from the root *mšl*).

4. *Hiphil.* The hiphil is somewhat commoner. It has three primary meanings:[36] (a) "carry out," (b) "deliver up, abandon," and (c) "make peace," a denominative from → שׁלום *šālôm.*

a. *Carry Out.* The imperfect form *yašlîm* in Isa. 44:26,28 refers to the carrying out of Yahweh's purpose — once with Yahweh himself as subject, once with his servant Cyrus. In a negative sense Yahweh carries out what he has appointed for Job (Job 23:14); *yašlîm ḥuqqî* might, however, be an explanatory gloss that actually misses the meaning of the text.[37] Job does not accept the carrying out of God's baneful plan: it enrages him (cf. vv. 15-17).

b. *Abandon.* Uncertainty reigns over the interpretation of the form *tašlimēnî,* which occurs twice in Isa. 38:12-13. One proposed translation is "abandon totally."[38] According to de Boer,[39] this word is not from *šlm* but is a shaphel form of *lamû (lāwû),* "surround," found only in Akkadian. De Boer translates: "Thou makest me besieged, sur-

30. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 184; but cf. D. J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20. WBC* 17 (1989), 198, 204.
31. Eisenbeis, 314.
32. See III.1.b above.
33. See III.2.b above.
34. See III.2.c above.
35. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1978), 271; for a different explanation see Eisenbeis, 323-24.
36. *HAL,* II, 1535-36.
37. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 363.
38. Cf. *HAL,* II, 1535.
39. P. A. H. de Boer, *OTS* 9 (1951) 180-81.

rounded, hemmed in." Eisenbeis reaches a similar conclusion: "finish."[40] Perhaps the best explanation is that of Wildberger, who suggests an aramaizing meaning, "give up" or "abandon," which is also supported by the LXX *(paredóthēn)*.[41]

c. *Make Peace.* The meaning "make peace" occurs in Josh. 10:1,4, where *hišlîm* is used with the prep. *'eṯ* to refer to the peace concluded between the Israelites and the Gibeonites. The same verb form, this time with the prep. *'el,* is used of the peace concluded between Hadadezer and David in 2 S. 10:19. In Dt. 20:12 and 1 Ch. 19:19, too, the hiphil with *'im* has approximately the same meaning, except that Dt. 20:12 speaks of an agreement reached even before the outbreak of hostilities, while 1 Ch. 19:19 is the parallel to 2 S. 10:19. In 1 K. 22:45(44) we are told that "Jehoshaphat was at peace with *(wayyašlēm 'im)* the king of Israel"; in other words, this text does not describe a change from war to peace. We also find *yašlîm* with an accusative object in Prov. 16:7: "When the ways of a man please Yahweh, he causes even his enemies to be at peace with him *('ittô)*." In Prov. 10:10 the reading *yašlîm,* "make peace," based on the LXX,[42] would represent an absolute usage; another possibility would be *ya'ᵃśeh šālôm.*[43]

5. *Hophal.* The only instance of the hophal is the form *hošlēmâ-lᵉḵā,* "live in peace with," in Job 5:23, in parallel with *'im . . . bᵉrîṯeḵā,* "you are in league with." This text may therefore be considered a passive counterpart to the meaning "make peace,"[44] more specifically to 1 K. 22:45(44), because it presupposes an existing state rather than a change.

IV. Adjective. The adjective has the following meanings: (1) intact, (2) full, (3) whole; peaceable.[45] Eisenbeis distinguishes two basic meanings: "whole" and "safe."[46]

1. *Intact.* In Gen. 33:18 Jacob comes to Shechem on his way to Paddan-aram *šālēm,* either "intact, safe(ly),"[47] or "with honorable or friendly intentions."[48] If the former, this would be the only instance of this meaning in connection with a human being (elsewhere only of stones[49]). If the latter, the expression would allude to Gen. 34:21.[50] A third possibility would be the name of the city Salem (with LXX, Syr., and Vg.):[51] "And Jacob came to Salem, the city of Shechem."

---

40. P. 331.
41. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 439.
42. *KBL*², 980.
43. See *BHS*.
44. See III.4.c above.
45. *HAL,* II, 1538-39.
46. P. 334.
47. *KBL*², 980.
48. Eisenbeis, 335, citing G. von Rad, *Genesis. ATD* II/4⁷, 287 (= *Genesis. OTL* [Eng. tr. ²1972], 328).
49. See below.
50. See IV.3 below.
51. *HAL,* II, 1506, 1539; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 523, 528, with the syntactic considerations supporting this interpretation.

Dt. 27:6 says that the altar is to be built of unhewn stones *(ʾᵃḇānîm šᵉlēmôṯ).* The prohibition against using hewn stones is found in Ex. 20:25. The stones that Joshua uses to build an altar on Mt. Ebal are also to be *šᵉlēmôṯ,* "unhewn, untouched by iron." The subject of 1 K. 6:7 is the stones used for the temple: "The temple was built with stones finished at the quarry *(ʾeḇen-šᵉlēmâ massāʿ).*"[52] Here the point is not that the stones are unhewn, but that they must not be shaped at the site of the temple.[53] At the same time, however, the intent behind the term is clear: to express "the intactness of the sacred temple 'house.'"[54]

2. *Full.* The meaning "be full, complete" is present in Gen. 15:16, which speaks of the measure of the Amorites' "guilt" or "sin": "for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete *(lōʾ-šālēm).*" This expression may even play on the preceding "you shall go to your ancestors in peace *(bᵉšālôm)*" (v. 15).

In Dt. 25:15 the expressions "full and honest weight" and "full and honest measure" appear in the context of commercial law (cf. Prov. 11:1).

In Ruth 2:12 Boaz expresses the hope that Yahweh will repay Ruth for her solidarity with the people of her deceased husband.[55] The wish is then amplified: "May you have a full reward." Possibly we have here another instance of a deliberate coupling of two forms of the same root.

In Am. 1:6,9, Gaza and Tyre are charged with "making entire towns captive." Here, however, another possible meaning is "allied" (as the subordinate partners).[56] The expression *hōglāṯ šᵉlômîm* in Jer. 13:19 (MT) is often emended (with LXX, Syr., and Vg.) to *gālûṯ šᵉlēmâ.*[57] In 2 Ch. 8:16 (MT) the expression *šālēm bêṯ yhwh* means something like "until the house of Yahweh was finished completely." This passage is often emended on the basis of the LXX to *ʿaḏ-kallôṯ šᵉlōmô,* "until Solomon had completed it."

3. *Whole; Peaceable.* The meanings "whole, undivided" and "peaceably inclined" or "well-meaning, upright,"[58] still combined by *KBL*², are kept distinct by *HAL,* a change that cannot absolutely be assessed as an advance. In Gen. 34:21 the sons of Jacob are characterized as *šālēm* in the sense of "peaceably minded, peaceful"; their attitude is viewed as a prerequisite for an "alliance." In 2 S. 20:19 we find the variant *šālum.*[59]

A series of texts use different combinations of → לב *lēḇ,* "heart," and *šālēm,* "pure, undivided," as either an attributive or a predicate adjective, often in conjunction with the prep. *ʿim,* "with" or "with respect to" (1 K. 8:61; 11:4; 15:3,14; Isa. 38:3; 1 Ch. 12:39[38]; 28:9; 29:9,19; 2 Ch. 15:17; 16:9; 19:9; 25:2). Eisenbeis sees a difference

52. On the construction see M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 98-99.
53. Eisenbeis, 337.
54. Noth, *Könige I,* 116.
55. See III.2.b above.
56. R. H. Smith, *ZAW* 77 (1965) 144.
57. W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 408.
58. Eisenbeis, 336.
59. Cf. *HAL,* II, 1533.

between the Dtr use of the expression and its use in Chronicles: in the former, we have "unconditional obedience with one's whole will and being," in the latter, "obedience to the divine will as fulfillment of specific concrete requirements."[60] A third meaning, according to Eisenbeis,[61] is found in 2 K. 20:3: "with a proper disposition." According to Baumgärtel,[62] the expression means total devotion; cf. Akk. *libbu gamru.*[63]

In Nah. 1:12 Rudolph renders *šᵉlāmîm* as "at the height of their power."[64] It parallels *rabbîm,* "many," and describes the Assyrians in the time of Sennacherib in contrast to the time of the prophet.

V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX translates the verb some 55 times with forms of *(antapo-, apo-)didónai* and 27 times with *apotínein.*

The Dead Sea Scrolls incorporate the broad semantic spectrum of the verb, and in addition use the hithpael a few times. The piel of *šlm* is used as a technical term for "repayment" in both the positive and the negative sense (1QS 2:6; 10:18; 1QM 6:6; 1QpHab 12:2; 4QpPs 37 4, 9, always with the obj. *gmwl*). The hithpael has the same meaning: 4QPs[f] 8:5//11QPs[a] 22:10 (par. *bḥn* niphal); 4Q385 2 3//386 1 1:3//388 3 3, "when will their *ḥsd* be repaid?" Here too belongs the personal *(brwšw)* indemnification of 1QS 7:7,8. Fulfillment of laws or payment of vows is the subject of 1QS 10:6; 4QPs[f] 10:9; 11QT 53:11 (piel); 39:8 (hiphil). The hiphil is also used to designate the completion of a period of time (years or days: CD 4:8,10; 10:10; 11QT 45:8). CD 9:20 speaks of final condemnation after a thrice-repeated offense. Finally, Raphael's restoration of the devout (to health) is mentioned in 11QPsAp[a] 4:3. There are fragmentary occurrences in 4Q381 38 3; 499 1 3; 503 1-6 3:16.

The adjective appears 3 times with the subst. *lēḇ,* "with one's whole/perfect heart."

Illman

60. P. 348.
61. P. 339.
62. *TDNT,* III, 607.
63. *AHw,* I, 279-80.
64. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 158-59.

שְׁלָמִים *šᵉlāmîm*

I. Etymology: 1. Hebrew; 2. Semitic Parallels. II. OT Usage: 1. Occurrences and Distribution; 2. Constructions; 3. Function and Meaning; 4. LXX; Modern Versions. III. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. According to the masoretic tradition, *šᵉlāmîm* is a plural of a noun of *qaṭl* type.[1] In the MT the sg. *šelem* < *šalm* is attested only in Am. 5:22. (Eisenbeis[2] expresses doubts concerning the masoretic assignment of this singular and proposes instead *šillum* or *šillēm;*[3] Loretz considers the singular a scribal error.[4]) The interpretation and function of this plural are disputed. It has been interpreted (a) as an abstract plural of amplification,[5] i.e., an intensification of "being well"; and (b) as an invariable plural,[6] i.e., "sacrificial portions," secondarily extended by synecdoche to denote the entire sacrificial rite. Rendtorff[7] expresses doubt that the form is a "genuine plural" in the light of Ugar. *šlmm* (although its morphological analysis is far from clear[8]), but admits that the OT always treats *šlmym* as a grammatical plural. (Of course it is impossible to make this claim with full assurance, since *šlmym* never occurs as the subject of a verbal clause or qualified by an adjective.)

šᵉlāmîm. G. A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel. HSM* 41 (1987), esp. 36-55; A. Charbel, זבח שלמים (1967); idem, "Origine degli *šᵉlāmîm* in Israele," *RivB* 23 (1975) 261-78; idem, "La portata religiosa degli *šᵉlāmîm,*" *RivB* 18 (1970) 185-93; idem, "Sacrificio di comunione in Ugarit," *BeO* 14 (1972) 133-41; idem, "Sacrificio di comunione presso gli Assiro-Babilonesi," *BeO* 13 (1971) 135-40; idem, "Il sacrificio de comunione presso i Cartaginesi," *BeO* 12 (1970) 132-37; idem, "Il sacrificio di comunione presso i Greci," *BeO* 16 (1974) 263-73; idem, "Il sacrificio di comunione tra gli Arabi," *BeO* 15 (1973) 129-38; idem, "'Shelamim' nei documenti di Elefantina," *BeO* 12 (1970) 91-94; S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante. Études et commentaires* 61 (1966); M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (I)," *UF* 13 (1981) 63-100, esp. 77-88; W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel* שלם *im AT. BZAW* 114 (1969); G. Gerleman, "שלם *šlm* to have enough," *TLOT,* III, 1337-48, esp. 1345-46; idem, "Die Wurzel *šlm,*" *ZAW* 85 (1973) 1-14; B. Janowski, "Erwägungen zur Vorgeschichte des israelitischen *Šᵉlamîm*-Opfers," *UF* 12 (1980) 231-59; S. Łach, "Le sacrifice *zebaḥ šᵉlāmîm,*" *FO* 11 (1969) 187-94; B. A. Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord. SJLA* 5 (1974), esp. 3-52; O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexikographie (II)," *UF* 13 (1981) 127-35, esp. 127-31; A. Marx, "Heilsopfer," *NBL,* II, 108-9; J. Milgrom, "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT," *IDBSup*, 763-71, esp. 769-70; J. C. de Moor, "The Peace-Offering in Ugarit and Israel," *Schrift en Uitleg. FS W. H. Gispen* (Kampen, 1970), 112-17; K. Myhre, "'Måltidsofferet' i det gamle testamente," *TTK* 52 (1981) 107-20; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); L. Rost, *Studien zum Opfer im Alten Israel. BWANT* 113 (1981); A. Schenker, ed., *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im AT. FAT* 3 (1992) (with bibliog.); L. H. Schiffman, "*Shelamim* Sacrifices in the Temple Scroll," *FS Y. Yadin. ErIsr* 20 (1989) 176*-83*; R. Schmid, *Das Bundesopfer in Israel. SANT* 9 (1964); W. B. Stevenson, "Hebrew 'Olah and Zebach Sacrifices," *FS A. Bertholet* (1950), 488-97; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, esp. 415-56; idem, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Eng. tr. Cardiff, 1964); I. Willi-Plein, *Opfer und Kult im alttestamentlichen Israel. SBS* 153 (1993), esp. 92-95.

1. E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache,* II/1 (Leipzig, 1895), §43a.
2. Pp. 256-57.
3. See also de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, 427.
4. P. 129.
5. *GK,* §124e; so interpreted, e.g., by K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 51-52.
6. Gerleman, *TLOT,* III, 1345; also Janowski, 258 n. 182.
7. R. Rendtorff, *Leviticus II: 2,1–5,26. BK* III/2 (1990), 125.
8. See I.2 below.

Attempts at a semantic explanation of *šlmym* on the basis of its etymology are various, some starting with the verb, others with the noun or adjective: *šᵉlāmîm* < *šlm* qal: offering establishing communion between God and human beings; < *šlm* piel: payment, thank, redemption, or termination offering; < *šālôm:* peace or well-being offering, communion meal; < *šālēm* (adj.): perfect or concluding offering (cf. LXX *téleios*).[9] Analysis of the contexts and idioms where *šᵉlāmîm* appears may cast more light on its function and meaning than do the proposed etymologies.

2. *Semitic Parallels.* Scholars have also attempted to solve this problem with the help of occurrences of Sem. *šlm/šlmm* outside the OT, especially in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Punic texts. There are also scattered equivalents in epigraphic Hebrew and Old South Arabic.

a. *Ugaritic.* The forms *šlm* and *šlmm* occur in Ugaritic[10] in ritual texts, sacrificial tariffs, and mythological texts. While the sg. *šlm* in the sense of "sacrifice" is rare and disputed,[11] being reduced by Janowski[12] to two clear instances,[13] *šlmm* is common.[14] It is, however, both morphologically (plural or enclitic *-m?*[15]) and semantically disputed. Citing the context of one critical occurrence *(qḥ krt šlmm/šlmm)*[16] and also Akk. *šulmānu,*[17] Levine[18] has proposed recognizing the "basic sense" of "offering of greeting, tribute" for both secular and cultic usage. This proposal has been criticized by Janowski,[19] Dietrich and Loretz,[20] Loretz,[21] and Anderson[22] on contextual grounds: the term here has nothing to do with sacrifice but belongs to the language of treaties and means something like "peace overtures." Janowski[23] and others also prefer other possible Akkadian cognates: *salīmu*[*m*],[24] *salāmum* I,[25] *šalāmu* I,[26] *sulummā'u*[*m*], *sulummû.*[27]

Janowski urges caution before prematurely assuming that Ugar. *šlm(m)* and Heb.

9. For the translations proposed by various authors see Eisenbeis, 223-25; also II.4 below. For criticism of derivation from the noun see Rendtorff, *Studien,* 133.

10. *WUS,* no. 2614: "a type of sacrifice, an offering."

11. Dietrich and Loretz, 87-88, reject it as a sacrificial term; for texts see Janowski, 233 n. 6, 237.

12. Pp. 237-41.

13. *KTU* 1.23, 7, 26; Ras Ibn Hani 77/2B:6 (P. Bordreuil and A. Caquot, *Syr* 56 [1979] 298).

14. For texts see Janowski, 233 n. 6.

15. Dietrich and Loretz, 82, opt for the plural.

16. *KTU* 1.14, III, 26-29.

17. *AHw,* III, 1268.

18. Pp. 14-20; a similar solution was proposed by de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, 427.

19. Pp. 241-45.

20. Pp. 82-83.

21. P. 130.

22. Pp. 39ff., 44ff.

23. P. 245.

24. *AHw,* II, 1015-16.

25. *AHw,* II, 1013.

26. *AHw,* III, 1143.

27. *AHw,* II, 1057.

šlmym are equivalent, on the grounds that the former (unlike *šlmym*) appears at the beginning and at the end of sacrificial tariffs, and the context makes no mention of applying blood or burning fat.[28] On the other hand, he does admit that the two terms probably share a "basic resemblance,"[29] since one text[30] shows clearly that the Ugar. *šlm(m)* offering, like the *šᵉlāmîm,* involved a communal meal; furthermore, the common Ugaritic word pair *šrp wšlmm*[31] seems to correspond to the Hebrew combination *ʿôlâ — šᵉlāmîm.*[32]

Attempts at a clear terminological definition of Ugar. *šlm(m)* have not been successful. Loretz defines it as a sacrifice performed by the king.[33] Religio-historically, Janowski[34] treats *šlmym* as being proper to the Anatolian and West Semitic sacrificial cult, in contrast to Schmid's hypothesis[35] of Minoan-Mycenaean influence on Ugaritic and hence indirectly on Israel.

b. *Phoenician-Punic.* Occurrences of *šlm/šlmm* in Phoenician and Punic have also been cited in explanation of *šᵉlāmîm.*[36] The relevant texts are the Phoenician inscriptions *KAI* 51.5 *(šlmm?)* and *KAI* 30.3ff. (*šlmm?*[37]), both very fragmentary; the Punic inscription (the Marseille sacrificial tariff) *KAI* 69.3,5,7,9,11 *(šlm kll);* and the Neo-Punic inscription *KAI* 120.2 *(šlm hršt/n).* It has often been suggested that Pun. *šlm kll* (also in Ugaritic: *šlmm kll*[38]) may be identified with Heb. *ʿôlâ/kālîl,* since in them neither the priests nor those who offer the sacrifice receive any of the sacrificial flesh; but this suggestion has been challenged on the grounds that Phoen.-Pun. *šlm(m)* also occurs without *kll* and the combination *šlm kll*[39] is syntactically dubious.[40] Materially, there is a better parallel between the Punic sacrificial term *ṣwʿt*[41] and Heb. *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm,* since the sacrificial offerings are distributed identically in both.[42] But all these comparisons are still subject to the limitation stated by de Vaux that the Israelite and Phoenician-Punic sacrificial systems "developed independently of each other, and their terminology was not altogether the same."[43]

c. *Hebrew.* In the Hebrew epigraphic material, we cite the occurrence of *šlm* in l. 8

---

28. Pp. 232-33, 249.

29. P. 258; cf. de Moor, 116. Loretz, 127 n. 4, and 130, reaches the same conclusion with more confidence.

30. *KTU* 1.115.

31. For citations see Janowski, 235.

32. See II.2 and 3 below.

33. P. 130.

34. P. 253.

35. Pp. 92-93.

36. *DISO,* 305, on *šlm* III.

37. So read by E. Puech, *Sem* 29 (1979) 19-26.

38. *KTU* 1.115, 9-10; Janowski, 246-47.

39. *KAI* 69.3,5,7,9,11.

40. Janowski, 255.

41. *KAI* 69.3-13; 74.4-5; *CIS,* I, 3915, 2.

42. Janowski, 256.

43. *AncIsr,* II, 439.

of the *bêt-yhwh* ostracon from Arad;[44] Levine[45] has claimed that it is equivalent to biblical Heb. *šelem/šᵉlāmîm,* but his proposal is disputed.[46]

d. *Old South Arabic.* In the domain of Old South Arabic, the cultic term *mslm* has also been cited in this connection; it has been defined as a cult object (altar?) at which an **slm* offering was performed,[47] a sacrificial ritual of primarily social significance. Ryckmans connects it with Heb. *šlm/šlmym.*[48]

II. OT Usage.

1. *Occurrences and Distribution.* The majority of the 86 OT occurrences of *šᵉlāmîm/šelem* (an exclusively cultic term) are in P (50), Ezekiel (6), and ChrH (8); but there are enough isolated occurrences in non-P Pentateuch texts (4), DtrH (17), Am. 5:22, and Prov. 7:14 to show that its function and meaning are not limited to exilic and postexilic ritual texts:[49] it has a broader literary distribution and is used in texts that antedate P. It is true, however, that Priestly redaction is assumed for some occurrences in DtrH.[50]

Outside P, *šᵉlāmîm* (always in conjunction with *ʿôlôṯ*) are mentioned in several contexts: laws governing altar building and their use (Ex. 20:24; Dt. 27:7; Josh. 8:3) as well as accounts of altars and their use for offering sacrifice (Ex. 24:5; 32:6; Josh. 22:23,27; 1 K. 9:25; 2 K. 16:13), ritual lamentation during the war with the Benjaminites (Jgs. 20:26; 21:4), the election of Saul as king (1 S. 10:8; 11:15), and Saul's campaign against the Philistines (1 S. 13:9). David offers *šᵉlāmîm* (together with *ʿôlôṯ*) after the procession with the ark (2 S. 6:17-18//1 Ch. 16:2) and after his purchase of the threshing floor of Araunah (2 S. 24:25//1 Ch. 21:26). Solomon does the same at his accession (1 K. 3:15) and at the dedication of the temple (1 K. 8:63-64//2 Ch. 7:7).

The only occurrence in the prophetic corpus apart from Ezekiel, in Am. 5:22, is also the only occurrence of the singular *(šelem);* the context is an invective declaring that God despises all human sacrifice *(ʿôlôṯ, minḥôṯ, šelem).*[51]

The occurrences in Ezekiel's vision of the restored temple are associated with the building of the altar and its consecration (Ezk. 43:27) and the sacrifices to be offered by the *nāśîʾ* (45:17; 46:2,12a,12c). The *šᵉlāmîm* also have an expiatory function (45:15).

In Prov. 7:14, the only occurrence in wisdom literature, *zibḥê šᵉlāmîm* parallels "vows" *(nēḏer).*

The special material of the Chronicler recounts Hezekiah's reform of the temple

44. Y. Aharoni, *IEJ* 16 (1966) 5-7.

45. P. 19 n. 46.

46. For bibliog. see Janowski, 245 n. 89.

47. G. Garbini, *AION* 23 (1973) 31-46.

48. G. Ryckmans, *JEOL* 14 (1955/56) 81.

49. Rendtorff, *Leviticus II,* 123.

50. Rendtorff, *Studien,* 124-25; idem, *Leviticus II,* 122 (on 1 S. 10:8).

51. For a different interpretation see H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 258-59, 263; Loretz, 128.

sacrifices as well as their abundance (2 Ch. 29:35; 30:22; 31:2) and also speaks of Manasseh as a restorer of the sacrificial cult (33:16, in the context of altar building).

The occurrences of *šᵉlāmîm* (usually in the phrase *zeḇaḥ/ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm*) in P culminate in the sacrificial *tôrâ* in Lev. 3:1,3,6,9. Here the interest in the sacrifice focuses exclusively on what is given to Yahweh (the burning of the fat portions), not the participation of the individual who provides the sacrifice.[52] By contrast, the detailed *tôrâ* in Lev. 7:11-36 makes clear the characteristic feature of the *šᵉlāmîm* offering: a sacrificial meal in which the sacrificial animal is shared by the person who provides the offering (vv. 14-18) and the priest (vv. 32-34), within the framework of the separate rituals of → תרומה *tᵉrûmâ* and → תנופה *tᵉnûp̱â*. Lev. 10:14 and Ex. 29:28 may be viewed as allusions to this provision for the priests. Other regulations govern the validity of the *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* (Lev. 7:20-21) and its subspecies, the thanksgiving offering and the fire offering (7:13; 7:29-30). The occurrences in Lev. 4:10,26,31,35; 6:5(Eng. 12) are merely allusions to the *tôrâ* in ch. 3.

Lev. 9:4,18,22 include *šᵉlāmîm* with *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* and *'ôlâ* as the principal sacrifices offered by Aaron on the eighth day after his investiture.

Several passages in H deal with *zeḇaḥ/ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm*. Lev. 17:5 distinguishes sacrifices offered in the open field *(zᵉḇāḥîm)* from those offered at the sanctuary *(ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm);* 19:5 regulates the validity of the sacrificial meal analogously to 7:15ff.; 22:21 concerns the fitness of the sacrificial animals. In the calendar of festivals 23:19 requires a *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* during the Feast of Weeks.

The regulations governing the vows taken by nazirites include the offering of *šᵉlāmîm* in conjunction with *'ôlâ* and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* (Nu. 6:14,17-18). We also find *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* in the context of a list of sacrifices in its twelve occurrences in Nu. 7:17ff., which list the offerings of the twelve tribal leaders. Nu. 10:10 requires that trumpets be blown during festivals with *ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm*. In 15:9 and 29:39 *šᵉlāmîm* conclude lengthy lists of various sacrifices.

In summary, our survey reveals a striking association of our term with altar building, its obligatory inclusion with other sacrificial terms *(zeḇaḥ, 'ôlâ),* and its tendency to be the final element in lists of sacrifices.

2. *Constructions.* If there is anything that can be said about the function and meaning of this hitherto unexplained term[53] or the nature of the sacrifice it refers to, it is more likely to emerge from a description of the word's verbal and nominal constructions than from etymological efforts. Total clarity, however, remains out of reach even by this approach.

a. *Verbal Constructions.* The verbal constructions with *šᵉlāmîm* as direct object and a human subject (priest, people, an individual) are distinguished by the usual verbs denoting cultic actions, which are also constructed with other sacrificial terms: *zbḥ* (Ex. 20:24; 24:5; Lev. 17:5; 19:5; Dt. 27:7; Josh. 8:31; 1 S. 11:15; 1 K. 8:63; 2 Ch. 30:22

52. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 51-52.

53. Gerleman, *TLOT,* III, 1345-46.

[piel]; 33:16), *ngš* hiphil (Ex. 32:6; 1 S. 13:9), *qrb* hiphil (Lev. 3:3,9; 7:13,29,33; 22:21; Nu. 6:14; 1 Ch. 16:1), *ʿśh* (Lev. 9:22; Nu. 6:17; 15:8; Josh. 22:23; 1 K. 3:15; 8:64; Ezk. 43:17; 45:17; 46:2,12a,c; 2 Ch. 7:7), *ʿlh* hiphil (Jgs. 20:26; 21:4; 2 S. 6:17-18; 24:25; 1 K. 9:25; 1 Ch. 16:2; 21:26, always with *ʿôlôṯ* as the first object), also *kwl* hiphil (1 K. 8:64) and *nbṭ* hiphil (Am. 5:22, with God as subject).[54] This group of verbs does not immediately suggest an exact meaning for *š^e^lāmîm*, and it confirms once again the gradual dominance of the leveling influence of P's terminology, which reduces sacrificial rituals to the pattern of *ʿôlâ* and *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ*. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern a differentiation in such constructions: the action *ʿlh* hiphil, "cause to go up," is still preserved in the original sense of *ʿôlâ*, whereas other verbs are chosen for the object *(zeḇaḥ) š^e^lāmîm: zbḥ* (Ex. 24:5; Dt. 27:6-7; Josh. 8:31; 1 S. 10:8), *ngš* hiphil (Ex. 32:6), *ʿśh* (Josh. 22:23; 1 K. 3:15). In particular, the five occurrences of *š^e^lāmîm* with *zbḥ* demonstrate the association (probably obligatory) of the *š^e^lāmîm* offering with some form of slaughtering.[55] This conclusion is confirmed by instances where the phrase *zeḇaḥ š^e^lāmîm* does not lead to a stylized paronomasia, but *zbḥ* takes *š^e^lāmîm* alone as its object (Ex. 20:24; Dt. 27:7; Josh. 8:31). The original relative independence of the *š^e^lāmîm* offering, postulated by Rendtorff, is thus supported by the syntactic evidence of this striking differentiation.

The conclusion that the *š^e^lāmîm* offering was firmly associated with the slaughtering of an animal is also supported by constructions where the direct object is an animal with *š^e^lāmîm* in apposition, e.g., *šḥt ʾeṯ-haššôr zeḇaḥ hašš^e^lāmîm* (Lev. 9:18). Similar constructions (also using *l^e^*) are found with *lqḥ* (Lev. 9:4), *ʿāśâ* (Lev. 23:19), and *qrb* hiphil (Nu. 7:17-18); cf. the constructions with partitive *min* in Lev. 7:32; 10:14 (*ntn* niphal); and 7:34 *(lqḥ)*, which stipulate the apportioning of the sacrificial animal. Lev. 4:10 (*rwm* hophal) and 4:31,35 *(swr* [hophal] *ḥēleḇ)* point to elements of the sacrificial procedure.

Further insight into constituent elements of the *š^e^lāmîm* offering is provided by other constructions: *qṭr* (hiphil) *ḥelḇê hašš^e^lāmîm* (Lev. 4:26; 6:5), which suggests that the fat portions were burned for Yahweh; *zāraq dam hašš^e^lāmîm* (Lev. 7:14; 2 K. 16:13), which suggests a libation of blood; and *ʾāḵal b^e^śar zeḇaḥ (tôḏaṯ) š^e^lāmîm* (Lev. 7:15,18,20-21), which illustrates the close association with a sacrificial meal. Of these, the meal alone may be assumed to have been an element of all *š^e^lāmîm* observances,[56] since several contexts attest to its association with a meal (Ex. 32:6; Dt. 27:7; 2 S. 6:19; 1 K. 3:15). The attempt of Rendtorff[57] to identify the libation of blood as the original rite peculiar to the *š^e^lāmîm* was subsequently given up.[58] Gerleman proposed connecting *š^e^lāmîm* etymologically with the portions of the animal reserved for Yahweh (fat, kidneys, etc.), which paid for and ransomed the flesh for the meal; but there is insufficient textual evidence to support so broad a claim.[59]

Our description of the verbal constructions of *š^e^lāmîm* thus allows us to conclude

---

54. See now *HAL*, II, 1538.
55. Rendtorff, *Studien*, 119-68.
56. Also Rendtorff, *Leviticus II*, 121-22, contra his *Studien*, 132.
57. *Studien*, 156-57.
58. *Leviticus II*, 129.
59. *TLOT*, III, 1346.

that it was associated with some form of slaughtering and ended with a sacrificial meal. The occurrences of *šᵉlāmîm* in both Priestly and non-Priestly contexts support this conclusion.

b. *Nominal Constructions.* We have already observed the tendency of *šᵉlāmîm* not to appear in isolation but to be linked with other sacrificial terms. When we examine these nominal constructions, the evidence includes appositional and construct phrases with *šᵉlāmîm,* but also lists, syndetic series, and clause groups with synonymous predicates (e.g., *ʿlh* and *zbḥ*).

(1) The most striking construction, especially outside the P corpus, is the linking of *šᵉlāmîm* with *ʿôlâ/ʿôlôṯ* as a double object of the sacrificial verbs *ʿlh* hiphil, *zbḥ, ngš* hiphil, *ʿśh,* and *qrb* hiphil. This construction appears in the earlier texts Ex. 20:24; Jgs. 20:26; 21:4; 1 S. 13:9; 2 S. 6:17-18 (par.); 24:25 (par.); 1 K. 9:25, as well in Ezk. 43:27; 46:2,12; and 2 Ch. 31:2. The texts using two different verbs (Ex. 24:5; 32:6; Dt. 27:6-7; Josh. 8:31; 22:23; 1 S. 10:8; 1 K. 3:15[60]) may also provide further evidence of the pre-Priestly origin of the bipartite phrase *ʿôlâ/ʿôlôṯ šᵉlāmîm.* This bipartite expression does not occur in Leviticus (6:5[12] belongs to a different context). These legislative and narrative texts outside P speak of a double sacrifice offered on important public occasions by the people as a whole, the king, or (in Ezekiel) the *nāśîʾ*.[61]

Unlike P, these texts say nothing about the precise details of *ʿôlôṯ* and *šᵉlāmîm,* nor about the similarities and differences between the two kinds of sacrifice. In the context of this construction it is impossible to call *šᵉlāmîm* a "concluding sacrifice."[62] There was probably a common, established sequence of sacrifices; Janowski has commented perceptively that this sequence reflects "an antithesis immanent in the ritual, not a juxtaposition of things essentially different," i.e., "a juxtaposition of two fundamental types of cultic sacrifice [gift to the deity and community observance]."[63]

On the basis of these texts, Rendtorff[64] defines this "early" *šᵉlāmîm* as an official public sacrificial ceremony, in contrast to the isolated → זבח *zbḥ,* which must be considered a private, local, familial observance[65] (cf. *zeḇaḥ mišpāḥâ* [1 S. 20:29], *zeḇaḥ hayyāmîm* [1 S. 20:6]). Of course this differentiation comes into question when the construction *zeḇaḥ/ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm,* found primarily in P, occurs in the earlier texts (Josh. 22:23,27; 1 S. 10:8; 11:15; 1 K. 8:63). Since these texts can hardly be set apart by literary analysis,[66] we must recognize a close connection between *zeḇaḥ* and *šᵉlāmîm* for the earlier period as well. Rendtorff now speaks of *šᵉlāmîm* as a "public counterpart" to *zeḇaḥ*.[67] It is also conceivable that, like the verbal construction *zbḥ*

60. See II.2.a above.

61. On the sociohistorical classification of these sacrificial observances see Anderson, 49ff.

62. Rendtorff, *Studien,* 133.

63. Pp. 253, 258 n. 182, following W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Eng. tr. 1983), 12.

64. *Leviticus II,* 121-22.

65. Ibid., 120.

66. Now ibid., 123, contra his *Studien,* 150-51.

67. *Leviticus II,* 127, following B. Lang (→ IV, 23) and Łach.

šᵉlāmîm,[68] the nominal combination with *zeḇaḥ* expresses and emphasizes the semantic element of "slaughtering, meal" as being specific to the *šᵉlāmîm* sacrifice.

(2) A systematic listing of the 49 occurrences of the construction *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* may be presented as follows: the singular form has the variants *zeḇaḥ haššᵉlāmîm* (26 times: Leviticus, Numbers, 1 K. 8:63), *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* (bis: Leviticus), *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm lᵉyhwh* (4 times: Leviticus, Numbers), *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmāyw* (3 times: Leviticus), *zeḇaḥ tôḏaṯ šᵉlāmāyw* (bis: Leviticus); the plural form has the variants *ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm* (5 times: Joshua, 1 Samuel, Proverbs, Chronicles), *ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm lᵉyhwh* (Lev. 17:5), *ziḇḥê šalmêhem/-ḵem* (4 times: Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers), *ziḇḥê šalmê bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl* (Lev. 10:14), *zᵉḇāḥênû ûšᵉlāmênû* (Josh. 22:27), and *zᵉḇāḥîm šᵉlāmîm lᵉ/lipnê yhwh* (bis: Exodus, 1 Samuel). The construct phrases predominate and exhibit the close relationship or gradual coalescence of the two sacrificial terms. In the context of P, the combination of both to denote a single type of sacrifice is probably an accomplished fact.[69] The two occurrences of the appositional phrase *zᵉḇāḥîm šᵉlāmîm* (Ex. 24:5; 1 S. 11:15)[70] and the coordinate construction *zᵉḇāḥênû ûšᵉlāmênû* (Josh. 22:27), however, still betray the original independence of the two terms, which Rendtorff[71] has rightly demonstrated, contrary to their earlier complete identification by de Vaux,[72] Stevenson,[73] Schmid, and Rost.[74]

In both constructions *zeḇaḥ/zᵉḇāḥîm* remains the primary term, qualified by the addition of *šᵉlāmîm.* The phrase *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* denotes "a specific or special type of זבח."[75] The differentiated morphosyntactic evidence also permits us to ask whether the relatively frequent contrast between *zeḇaḥ šalmê bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl/šalmêhem/-ḵem, šᵉlāmênû/šᵉlāmāyw* and *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm lᵉyhwh* allows a broader semantic spectrum for *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm,* in the sense of bilateral sacrificial portions (for Yahweh and for the individual offering the sacrifice). According to Lev. 3 and 7, such a shared sacrifice would be characteristic of the *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* as understood by P (contra Gerleman,[76] who maintains that *šᵉlāmîm* denotes only the portions belonging to Yahweh).

More generally, P's specialized usage of the phrase *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* must be distinguished from its earlier usage. One important passage attesting to the narrowing of the terminology is Lev. 17:5, which restricts *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* to the central sanctuary.[77] It is noteworthy that Ezekiel does not use the construction *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm;* this observation reveals differences in sacrificial terminology within the priestly tradition. It is impossible to establish a universally applicable meaning for the complex combination *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* and its variants.

---

68. See II.2.a above.
69. Rendtorff, *Leviticus II,* 119.
70. Levine, 22, 28; Rendtorff, *Leviticus II,* 123.
71. *Studien,* 119-20; idem, *Leviticus II,* 118-20.
72. *AncIsr,* II, 417.
73. P. 492.
74. Pp. 82-92.
75. Rendtorff, *Leviticus II,* 126.
76. *TLOT,* III, 1346.
77. See II.1 above.

(3) Constructions involving more specific sacrificial elements such as fat (*ḥēleḇ,* Lev. 4:26; 6:5e[12e]; 1 K. 8:64; 2 Ch. 29:35), blood (*dām,* Lev. 7:14,33; 2 K. 16:13), flesh (*bāśār,* Lev. 7:15,18,20-21), or the animal (*šôr, 'ayil,* Lev. 4:10; 9:18) underline the public nature of *šᵉlāmîm* as a sacrifice involving slaughtering and a meal; their interpretation is less problematic.

(4) Combinations associating *šᵉlāmîm* with other types of sacrifice or sacrificial rubrics reveal specific occasions or subclassifications and ritual elements. The occasion may be a thanksgiving sacrifice (*zeḇaḥ tôḏaṯ šᵉlāmāyw,* Lev. 7:13,15,18,20-21; 2 Ch. 33:16) or a votive offering (*nēḏer, nᵉḏāḇâ,* Lev. 7:16; 22:21; Nu. 15:8; 29:39; Prov. 7:14). In Lev. 3:1,6; 7:29, *šᵉlāmîm* is assigned to the category of *qorbān* offerings; according to Elliger, this classification resulted in its being subsumed among the rites of expiation.[78] Lev. 3:3,9 refer to elements of the *šᵉlāmîm* as *'iššeh lᵉyhwh.* According to Ex. 29:28 and Lev. 7:32, one part of the *šᵉlāmîm* is treated as a contribution *(tᵉrûmâ),*[79] i.e., it is given to the priest. Here too the shared apportionment rites of the *šᵉlāmîm* are evident.

(5) Also noteworthy is the tendency of *šᵉlāmîm* to appear in lists of sacrifices, always at the end. The following lists are found: *'ôlâ, ḥaṭṭā'ṯ, šᵉlāmîm* (Nu. 6:14); *'ôlâ, zeḇaḥ (nēḏer), šᵉlāmîm* (Nu. 15:8; Josh. 22:27); *'ôlâ, minḥâ, ḥelḇê/nēseḵ, dām, šᵉlāmîm* (1 K. 8:64b,6c [par.]; 2 K. 16:13). The sequence *'ôlôṯ, minḥôṯ, šelem* lies behind Am. 5:22; therefore this passage, although it presents both literary[80] and syntactic difficulties,[81] cannot be left out of the discussion of *šelem/šᵉlāmîm.*[82]

Ezekiel uses a different set of lists: *minḥâ, 'ôlâ, šᵉlāmîm* (Ezk. 45:15); *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ, minḥâ, 'ôlâ, šᵉlāmîm* (45:17); cf. the series in Nu. 7:12ff.: *minḥâ, 'ôlâ, ḥaṭṭā'ṯ, šᵉlāmîm.* A six-element list appears in Nu. 29:39: *niḏrêḵem, niḏḇōṯêḵem, 'ōlōṯêḵem, minḥōṯêḵem, niskêḵem, šalmêḵem.* In 2 Ch. 29:35 *'ôlâ* and *ḥelḇê haššᵉlāmîm* appear together, and *nᵉsāḵîm* joins *'ôlâ.*

All these lists, found mostly in Numbers and Ezekiel, include *'ôlâ* in one place or another and conclude with *šᵉlāmîm.* They probably represent a variable expansion and extension of the earlier doublet *'ôlâ — šᵉlāmîm*[83] to reflect Priestly notions and ideals *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* of expiation. For these lists the theory that *šᵉlāmîm* played a concluding role and may be translated "concluding sacrifice" appears plausible. It is hardly possible, however, to generalize this semantic component (cf. the series in Lev. 9:3-4).

(6) It is also possible for *šᵉlāmîm* or *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* to appear alone (1 S. 11:15; 1 K. 8:63; 2 Ch. 30:22). Here it functions as an isolated solemn sacrifice in observance of a special occasion: the designation of a king, the consecration of the altar, the Passover celebrated by Hezekiah. Cf. also Prov. 7:14, although here in conjunction with *nᵉḏārîm.*

---

78. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 51-52.

79. Ibid., 102-3.

80. Loretz, 129.

81. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 258-59.

82. W. Rudolph, *Joel — Amos — Obadja — Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 210-11; contra Loretz, 129; and Rendtorff, *Leviticus II,* 125.

83. See II.2.b.a above.

(7) Finally, discussion of the nominal constructions must mention the often-overlooked fact that *(zeḇaḥ) šᵉlāmîm* not infrequently is expanded by addition of the dative of interest *lᵉyhwh* or *lipnê yhwh/ʾᵉlōhîm,* which underlines the specialized meaning "sacrificial portion" suspected in several passages (Ex. 24:5; 29:28; Lev. 3:3,9; 7:29; 17:5; 19:5; 22:21; Nu. 6:17; 15:8; Jgs. 20:26; 1 S. 11:15; Ezk. 46:12).

3. *Function and Meaning.* Analysis of the verbal and nominal constructions allows us to state the following conclusions with respect to the functions of *šᵉlāmîm:*

a. The term *šᵉlāmîm* denotes a type of sacrifice associated with cultic slaughtering and a cultic meal; it can involve the burning of fat portions and blood libation.

b. In conjunction with *ʿôlâ* (in non-Priestly texts), *šᵉlāmîm* is part of a solemn double sacrifice on public occasions. In this context the expanded form *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* underlines that a meal in involved and differentiates *šᵉlāmîm* from *ʿôlâ* (cf. *heʿᵉlâ ʿôlâ/zbḥ šᵉlāmîm*).

c. In P texts the phrase *zeḇaḥ/ziḇḥê šᵉlāmîm* has become a specialized term in priestly cultic usage. Its function remains unexplained, and we do not know exactly what differentiates the phrase from *šᵉlāmîm* by itself. It is possible that in several passages we should recognize the specialized connotation "shared sacrificial portion," on the evidence of the adnominal construction *lᵉyhwh* and the pronominal relationship to *bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl* (cf. NEB: "shared offerings").[84] Possible occasions for *(zeḇaḥ) šᵉlāmîm* include votive offerings *(nēḏer)* and thanksgiving sacrifices *(tôḏâ).*

d. Only in the context of lists can *šᵉlāmîm* in final position function as a "concluding sacrifice." The expression *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* can also denote an individual sacrifice on special occasions.

4. *LXX; Modern Versions.* The complexity of our results rules out proposing a single equivalent for *šᵉlāmîm,* such as "thank offering" (Luther), "sacrifice of well-being" (NRSV), or "peace offering" (AV).

The LXX uses three equivalents, but they correspond to different groups of books rather than different contexts. In the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Chronicles, *šᵉlāmîm* is translated uniformly with forms of the nominalized adj. *sōtḗrios* (Nu. 6:14, *sōtēría*): *thysía sōtēríou* for *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm, tá sōtēría* for *šᵉlāmîm* or *ziḇḥê/zᵉḇāḥîm šᵉlāmîm.* In Samuel and Kings (and Prov. 7:14), the adj. *eirēnikós* predominates, used attributively *(thysíai eirēnikaí)* or nominalized *(hai eirēnikaí* for *šᵉlāmîm; thysíai, stéata tṓn eirēnikṓn).* The qal of the verb *šlm* may be translated by *sōtḗrios,* the noun *šālôm* by *eirēnikós.*[85] The Vg. uses *pacifica* throughout, following the practice of the LXX in Samuel and Kings. The third LXX equivalent uses the root *tel-* and appears only in 2 Ch. 29:35, where *bᵉḥelḇê haššᵉlāmîm* is translated by the pleonastic *en toís stéasin tḗs teleiṓseōs toú sōtēríou,* and in Jgs. 20:26 (LXX B), where *holokautṓseis kaí teleías* represents *ʿōlôṯ ûšᵉlāmîm.* This translation suggests the interpretation "conclud-

84. Milgrom, 769, citing Tos. *Zeb.* 11:1.

85. Contra Daniel, 275, 392-93.

ing sacrifice," as noted by Köhler,[86] although Daniel[87] believes that it derives from the adj. *šālēm,* "entire": "perfect sacrifices."

Modern versions and comms. use other uniform translations:[88] "sacrificial meal,"[89] "peace offering,"[90] "community offering,"[91] "sacrifice of well-being"[92] or "sacrificial meal of well-being,"[93] "covenant sacrifice,"[94] "well-being offering."[95] Instead of such pleonastic compounds, the analysis undertaken above suggests using a variety of translations, depending on the context and source stratum of each occurrence.[96]

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls do not use *šlmym* alone as a sacrificial term (*zbḥ* takes over its function in 1QS 9:4 and 1QM 2:5, in conjunction with *'wlwt;* see also CD 11:20). The Temple Scroll, however, contains five occurrences of the combination *zbḥ(y) šlmym* with a function analogous to that found in the OT: 11QT 37:5,11,12, borrowing from Lev. 10:14, have to do with the determination of cultically correct sites for the *zbḥy šlmy bny yśr'l* in the inner court of the temple. 11QT 52:15, probably seeking to enforce the directive of Dt. 12:6, orders that pure animals for *'wlh* and *zbḥ šlmym* be slaughtered within the sanctuary. In 63:15 a regulation allows a naturalized female prisoner of war to share in eating the *zbḥ šlmym* only after seven years have passed *(wzbḥ šlmym wlw' tw'kl 'd y'bwrw šb' šnym 'ḥr tw'kl).*

Seidl

---

86. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. tr. 1957), 188.

87. Pp. 287-88.

88. *HAL,* II, 1537; on the etymologies behind the individual translations see I.1 above.

89. Since A. Bertholet, *Leviticus. KHC* III (1901).

90. Since B. Baentsch, *Exodus — Leviticus — Numeri. HKAT* I/2 (1903).

91. M. Noth, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. ATD* V/7 (1959, 1962, 1966) (obscured in the Eng. translations available in OTL, which use RSV).

92. G. Beer and K. Galling, *Exodus. HAT* I/3 (1939), in loc.

93. Elliger, *Leviticus,* in loc.

94. Schmid.

95. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16. AB* (1991), 202-25, 412-39.

96. For an exemplary treatment of Ugar. *šlm(m),* with three different definitions, see D. M. L. Urie, *PEQ* 81 (1949) 67ff.

שָׁלַף *šālap̱*; שֶׁלֶף *šelep̱*

I. 1. Related Words; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. With *ḥereḇ;* 2. Other Usages. III. LXX.

I. 1. *Related Words.* The verb *šlp* appears relatively often with → חרב *ḥereḇ* as its object; it occurs also in other Semitic languages both in this specialized usage and with a broader range of meanings. It appears in Akkadian as *šalāpu(m),* "draw out" (a sword or other object), "wipe off,"[1] and in Syriac as *šlp,* "draw out," and "dry out, make tired."[2] It is probably also related to Arab. *salaba,* "steal, take away, snatch,"[3] with a development toward a more intensive meaning. Finally, *šlp* appears in Jewish Aramaic with the meaning "loosen, draw, draw out,"[4] and in Pahlavi as an Aramaic ideogram for "draw."[5] In Middle Hebrew there is also a noun *šelep̱,* "stubble," what is left after grain has been "pulled out." In Gen. 10:26 and 1 Ch. 1:20 *šelep̱* appears as a proper name, probably related to the name of a South Arabian tribe mentioned in inscriptions.[6] There also appears to be a *bʿlšlp* in the Phoenician-Punic domain.[7]

In contexts similar to those where *šlp* appears, the OT also uses *ḥlṣ, yṣ'* hiphil, *mšh, mšk, nsḥ, nsʿ, nṣl* piel and hiphil, *pšṭ,* and *šll* I, each expressing a particular aspect of the basic meaning "draw, pull."

2. *Occurrences.* Apart from various conjectural emendations,[8] there are 25 occurrences of *šlp* in the OT: 2 in Numbers, 1 in Joshua, 10 in Judges, 3 in Samuel, 1 in Kings, 1 in Psalms, 1 in Job, 2 in Ruth, and 4 in Chronicles. The majority of these are in preexilic texts; except for 1 Ch. 21:16, the passages in Chronicles are identical with the corresponding passages in DtrH.

II. 1. *With ḥereḇ.* In the majority of cases, *šlp* is used with *ḥereḇ* (dagger or military sword). The verb denotes the drawing of a sword (from a sheath or belt).[9] The formula *'îš šālap̱/šōlēp̱ ḥereḇ* thus becomes a technical term for a warrior able to take part in combat. It is used to state the number of participants in a battle (Jgs. 8:10 [Moabites]; 2 S. 24:9 [with *ḥayil* interpolated] par. 1 Ch. 21:5 [the mention of Judah here is secondary[10]]; 2 K. 3:26 [Moabites]). The extremely high numbers are striking and, given the relatively small population of Palestine, can hardly reflect reality. This obser-

1. *CAD,* XVII/1, 230-31; *AHw,* III, 1145-46.
2. *CSD,* 582.
3. Wehr, 420.
4. Jastrow, 1587.
5. *DISO,* 305.
6. G. R. Driver, *BASOR* 90 (1943) 34.
7. Benz, 418.
8. See II.2 below.
9. See already Gilg. IX, 1, 16
10. K. Galling, *Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. ATD* XII (1954), 61.

vation is especially important in Jgs. 20, a narrative (probably early) that recounts conflicts among the Israelite tribes during the period of the judges, since all the occurrences of *šlp* here (vv. 2,15,17,25,35,46) belong to a later recension that emphasizes "all Israel."[11]

A less formulaic but nevertheless significant use of *šlp* is found in a few passages that recount killings. "Drawing the sword" immediately precedes the killing. A "killing by request" is recounted in Jgs. 9:54; 1 S. 31:4//1 Ch. 10:4. The background is identical. Abimelech and Saul ask their armor bearers to kill them so that they may avoid what they consider an even more ignominious death. The killing of enemies is the subject of Jgs. 8:20 and 1 S. 17:51. Here too *šlp* precedes the actual killing, so that we may speak of a single action.

Four additional occurrences of *šlp* with *ḥereḇ* deserve mention. Nu. 22:23,31; Josh. 5:13; 1 Ch. 21:16 speak of the → מלאך *mal'āḵ* of Yahweh, "with a drawn sword in his hand." In Nu. 22:21-35 (J; possibly secondary[12]), the *mal'āḵ* is presented as a human figure, initially visible only to Balaam's donkey. Josh. 5:13 belongs to an episode (vv. 13-15) interpolated by the editor;[13] here the *mal'āḵ* introduces himself as the commander of Yahweh's army. The description of the angel with a sword recalls Gen. 3:24. A more developed notion of Yahweh's messenger is found in 1 Ch. 21:16. This passage clearly envisions a supernatural being, who stands between earth and heaven — unlike 2 S. 24, where the messenger is not described in detail.[14] Whether these texts that mention Yahweh's messenger reflect an Ugaritic background is impossible to say.[15]

2. *Other Usages.* Only a few texts use *šlp* in the more general sense of "draw out," attested elsewhere in the ancient Near East. Jgs. 3:22 stands somewhere between technical and general usage. With a certain irony, the narrator says that Eglon, the Moabite king, was so fat that Ehud could not withdraw his dagger from the latter's belly. Ruth 4:7-8 uses *šlp* in describing an ancient legal custom. As a sign that he waives his right to purchase a field, a right based on clan membership (cf. Lev. 25:25; Jer. 32:6-9), the "redeemer" *(gō'ēl)*[16] has to draw off his sandal[17] and give it as "a kind of 'receipt'"[18] to Boaz, who is willing to make the purchase. The drawing off and handing over of the sandal thus attest to a legal act.

In two other passages the presence of *šlp* has been challenged on text-critical grounds. In Ps. 129:6 the emendation of *šeqqaḏmaṯ šālap yāḇēš* to *šeqqāḏîm tišdōp*

---

11. M. Noth, *Der System das zwölf Stämme Israels. BWANT* 52 (1930), 162-70; H. Schulz, *Leviten im vorstaatlichen Israel und im Mittleren Osten* (Munich, 1987), 40; for a different view see T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AnAcScFen* B 198 (1977), 29.

12. *HPT,* 32.

13. M. Noth, *Joshua. HAT* I/7 (^{3}1971), 23.

14. See also T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. FRLANT* 106 (1972), 174-75 n. 247.

15. P. D. Miller, *Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (1973), 28-32, 128-31.

16. → גאל *g'l.*

17. → נעל *na'al.*

18. E. Zenger, *Ruth. ZBK* 8 (1986), 90; see also E. F. Campbell, *Ruth. AB* (1975), 149-50.

has often been proposed,[19] but is not compelling. The statement that the grass on the housetops "withers before it is pulled up" is quite in keeping with what follows, stating the reason for the failure of even a modest harvest.[20] In Job 20:25, in Zophar's description of the fate of the wicked, emendation of *šālap̱ wayyēṣēʾ miggēwâ* to *šelaḥ yāṣāʾ miggēwâ* has been proposed.[21] The text as it stands is supported by v. 24, which speaks of a fleeing man. An arrow strikes him in the back, and the wounded man draws it out himself (cf. Jgs. 3:22). The emendation presupposes that a javelin has struck him from the front and exited behind. In this case the *waw* before *bārāq* must also be deleted.[22] In Job 29:17, in Job's final defense, *BHS* proposes reading *ʾešlōp* instead of *ʾašlîḵ*.[23] The emendation has much to commend it on semantic grounds and is orthographically straightforward. The critical question is whether the hiphil of *šlk* can mean "tear out" — a meaning well within the realm of possibility in a poetic text like the book of Job.[24] In addition, *ṭerep* would be unusual as the object of *šlp*.

III. LXX. In the majority of cases the LXX uses the lexeme *spán* to translate *šlp*. Jgs. 3:22; 1 S. 17:51 (only Alexandrinus and Lucian); and Ps. 128:6 use *ekspán* instead (appropriately) — a translation that would have been reasonable in other passages as well. Only in Jgs. 20, with several occurrences, does Codex Vaticanus surprisingly use *hélkein*. Should this be seen as evidence — albeit secondary — of the frequently suspected special tradition behind Jgs. 20?

To date, *šlp* has not been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Mommer

19. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 560.
20. On *šlp* in the context of harvest see Jastrow, 1587.
21. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 326; M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* (³1974), 153.
22. K. Budde, *Hiob. HKAT* II/1 (²1913), 118.
23. See also Fohrer, *Hiob*, 403; G. Hölscher, *Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1937), 72.
24. → שׁלך *šlk*.

שָׁלֹשׁ *šālōš*; שְׁלוֹשִׁים *šᵉlôšîm*; שְׁלִשִׁי *šᵉlišî*; שׁלשׁ *šlš* piel, pual שָׁלִישׁ *šālîš*; שִׁלְשׁוֹם *šilšôm*; שִׁלֵּשִׁם *šillēšîm*

I. Ancient Near East. II. OT Usage: 1. Numeral; 2. Verb; 3. Derivatives; 4. Personal Names. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. LXX.

I. Ancient Near East. The root *šlš* (Aram. *tlt*) is represented in all Semitic languages,[1] primarily as the numeral "three." Many derivatives are found in Akkadian[2] in every period and in Ugaritic.[3] It does not seem reasonable to list the evidence for every language; therefore our examination of OT usage will include examples from cognate languages that clarify the distribution and usage of the root throughout the whole Semitic domain.

II. OT Usage.

1. *Numeral.* a. *General.* According to Mandelkern, there are some 650 occurrences of the number "three" with its extensions to 30, 300, and 3000 and its compounds such as 13, 23, 33, etc.[4] The discussion that follows will therefore attempt to assign the multiplicity of occurrences to useful categories. In addition to denoting a mathematical quantity, the number three can have symbolic or religious connotations. We shall not consider the cases in which the use of the number three is determined by the factual data of the narrative.[5]

b. *Quantity.* The OT uses *šlš* as a measure of quantity in many contexts. Structures often have three stories or sections, e.g., the ark (Gen. 6:16) and the enclosure surrounding the Solomonic temple (1 K. 6:6,8; Ezk. 41:6-7).[6] We read of three courses of stones (1 K. 6:36; 7:12; Ezr. 6:4), three window openings (1 K. 7:5), three ledges (Ezk. 41:16), and three pillars (Ex. 27:14-15; 38:14-15). The new Jerusalem has three gates on each of its four sides (Ezk. 48:32-34; cf. Rev. 21:13). The lampstand described in

---

šālôš. M. L. Barré, "New Light on the Interpretation of Hosea VI 2," *VT* 28 (1978) 129-41; P. C. Craigie, "An Egyptian Expression in the Song of the Sea (Exodus XV 4)," *VT* 20 (1970) 83-86, esp. 84-85; G. Delling, "*treís* etc.," *TDNT,* VIII (Eng. tr. 1972), 215-25; H. Donner, "Der 'Freund des Königs,'" *ZAW* 73 (1961) 269-77, esp. 275-77; K. Elliger, "Die dreissig Helden Davids," *PJ* 31 (1935) 29-75 = *KlSchr. ThB* 32 (1966), 72-118; M. Fraenkel, "Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Wortschatz," *HUCA* 31 (1960) 55-102, esp. 55-59; M. Görg, "Dreissig," *NBL,* I, 448-49; idem, "Dreizahl," *NBL,* I, 449; J. Hehn, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im AT* (Leipzig, 1907, repr. 1968), esp. 63-75; I. H. Jones, "Musical Instruments in the Bible, I," *BT* 37 (1986) 101-16; O. Margalith, "The Meaning of the Word *šalîš* in the Bible, in the Light of Ugaritic *ṯlṯ*," *BethM* 23 (1977/78) 69-72, 125-26; idem, "A Note on *šālîšîm*," *VT* 42 (1992) 266; B. A. Mastin, "Was the *šālîš* the Third Man in the Chariot?" in J. A. Emerton, ed., *Studies in the Historical Books of the OT. SVT* 30 (1979), 125-54; R. Mayer, "Die Verwendung der Dreizahl als Stilmittel im AT" (diss., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1944); N. Na'aman, "The List of David's Officers *(šālîšîm),*" *VT* 38 (1988) 71-79; F. Nötscher, "Zur Auferstehung nach drei Tagen," *Bibl* 35(1954) 313-19; D. G. Schley, "The *šālîšîm:* Officers or Special Three-Man Squads?" *VT* 40 (1990) 321-26; H. Seidel, *Musik in Altisrael. BEATAJ* 12 (1989), esp. 69; A. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York, 1969), esp. 381-84; B. Stade, "Die Dreizahl im AT," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 124-28; M. Vervenne, "Hebrew *šālîš* — Ugaritic *ṯlṯ*," *UF* 19 (1987) 355-73.

1. Citations in *HAL,* II, 1543-44; *DISO,* 305-6.
2. *AHw,* III, 1146, 1150, 1267, 1269-70, 1339.
3. *WUS* no. 2878.
4. Mandelkern, 1183-86.
5. Delling, 217.
6. T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel in Jerusalem. StFS* 3 (1970-80), I, ills. 49, 50.

Ex. 25:32-33 and 37:18-19 has three branches on each side, each decorated with three "cups shaped like almond blossoms." The sons of Eli have their servant use a three-pronged fork to fish the sacrificial meat out of the pot (1 S. 2:13). We encounter ten times three in Ezk. 41:6: there are thirty side chambers in the outbuilding surrounding the temple (cf. 40:17).

Many architectural features of the temple complex measure three cubits *('ammâ)* in height or length: Solomon's prayer platform in the temple is three cubits high (2 Ch. 6:13; cf. Ex. 27:1; 38:1); according to Ezk. 40:48, the gateways leading to the vestibule of the temple are three cubits wide. We may compare the words of the inscription describing the building of the Siloam tunnel: "and while there [were still] three cubits to be cut through, [there was heard] the voice of each man calling to his fellow."[7]

A measurement of ten times three cubits is also common: the palace of Solomon and his House of the Forest of Lebanon are thirty cubits high (1 K. 6:2; 7:2). The height of Noah's ark is thirty cubits, its length three hundred cubits (Gen. 6:15). The curtains of the tabernacle measure thirty cubits by four cubits (Ex. 26:8; 36:15). The numbers in 1 K. 7:23 have special significance for the history of mathematics: the "molten sea" measures ten cubits from brim to brim; a line of thirty cubits could encircle it. The circumference divided by the diameter approximates the value of π (about 3.14).

The number three (in fractions) plays a variety of roles in sacrificial practice (e.g., Lev. 14:10; Nu. 15:6-7,9); Neh. 10:33(Eng. 32) records the obligation to pay annually "one-third of a shekel for the service of the house of our God."[8]

Money and weight often involve the value "three." Thirty shekels of silver are the compensation if an ox gores a male or female slave (Ex. 21:32); the same sum must be paid in settlement of a vow made by a woman from twenty to sixty years of age (Lev. 27:4). In the cryptic allegory in Zec. 11:4-17, thirty shekels of silver are the wages of the prophet for his services as a shepherd (v. 12). Whether this is an allusion to the value of a slave is uncertain; in any case, it is a small sum. In the NT the high priests pay Judas Iscariot thirty pieces of silver to betray Jesus (Mt. 26:15; cf. 27:3,9; here the text surprisingly refers to Jeremiah, but more likely it is a mixed citation). King Hezekiah pays thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver as tribute to the Assyrians (2 K. 18:14). Joseph gives his brother Benjamin a gift of three hundred pieces of silver (Gen. 45:22). The bronze spear of Ishbi from Nob, a descendant of the giants, weighs three hundred shekels (2 S. 21:16).

c. *Time.* The time interval "after three days (months/years)" or "on the third day" plays so dominant a role in the literature of the OT that we can list only a few examples to illustrate its various contexts, beginning with the passages where "three days" serves as a measure of distance. The flocks of Jacob and Laban are three days' journey apart (Gen. 30:36). The Israelites wish to go a three days' journey into the wilderness to celebrate a festival for Yahweh (Ex. 3:18; 5:3; 8:23[27]). It takes three days to walk across the great city of Nineveh (Jon. 3:3).

7. *KAI* 189.2-3; II, 186.
8. Cf. *KAI* 69.9-11.

A period of three days is also of great importance in cultic and religious practice. The leftover flesh of a sacrifice must be destroyed on the third day (Lev. 7:16-17; 19:6-7); any uncleanness must be removed on the third day (Lev. 19:12).

From narrative material we cite the following examples: on the third day Laban discovers that Jacob has fled (Gen. 31:22); Joseph interprets the three vine branches and the three baskets as three days (Gen. 40:12-13,18-19,20; cf. 42:17-18); darkness covered the land of Egypt for three days (Ex. 10:22); Samson's wedding guests cannot guess his riddle even after three days (Jgs. 14:14; cf. 2 S. 20:4; 1 K. 12:12); Esther calls for a fast that will last for three days and three nights (Est. 4:16); Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights (Jon. 2:1[1:17]).

Beyse

In Hos. 6:2 "after two days" and "on the third day" denote a short period of time: the people who return to Yahweh affirm that he will revive (*ḥyh* piel) them after two days and raise them up (*qwm* hiphil) on the third day. Christian exegesis has interpreted this passage as a reference to the resurrection on the third day, and many modern interpreters have searched for prototypes in the cult of dying and rising gods. But the text says nothing of death and resurrection; it probably has to do with recovery from a disease (*rāpā'* and *ḥāḇaš,* v. 1b; the Psalms also use *ḥîyâ* in a similar sense), and the parallels in other religions are uncertain or late at best (Osiris, in Plutarch; Adonis, according to Lucian). Barré has pointed out a different possibility: Akkadian omen texts dealing with medical questions use similar expressions to prognosticate a rapid recovery.

Ringgren

A period of three months is less common (Gen. 38:24: Tamar's pregnancy; Ex. 2:3: the time Moses' mother was able to hide him; 2 S. 6:11: the time the ark remained in the house of Obed-edom). Three years, however, play a more important role: Absalom stays at Geshur for three years after fleeing from David (2 S. 13:38); Solomon's fleet needs three years for the voyage to Tarshish and back (1 K. 10:22); there was peace between Aram and Israel for three years (1 K. 22:1; cf. also 2 K. 17:5; 18:10; Isa. 20:3). The intervals three days — three months — three years appear in 2 S. 24:13, where David is asked to choose from three punishments for carrying out the forbidden census: three days of pestilence, three months of flight, or three years of famine; he chooses the briefest evil (v. 15). There are thirty days of mourning for Aaron (Nu. 20:29) and for Moses (Dt. 34:8). King Darius is asked to issue an edict declaring that for thirty days no one other than King Darius is to be prayed to (Dnl. 6:8,13[7,12]).

The start of the fourth decade of life (about thirty years) clearly has special significance in the life of a man. The "patriarchs after the deluge" beget their first sons at this age (Gen. 11:12,14,16,18,22); Israel's kings take office at this time of life: David at thirty (2 S. 5:4), Joram at thirty-two (2 K. 8:17), and Jehoshaphat at thirty-five (1 K. 22:42). It is also possible that the Levites begin their service at thirty, since this is the

age at which they are counted (1 Ch. 23:3). Jesus of Nazareth may also belong in this context, since he began his work when he was thirty (Lk. 3:23).

d. *Objects*. Triads of objects and things are also common: there are three cities of refuge east and west of the Jordan (Dt. 4:41; 19:9); a concubine has a right to three things (Ex. 21:10-11); Joab kills Absalom with three spears (2 S. 18:14; cf. also Dnl. 7:8,20,24: the three horns of the fourth beast represent three kingdoms).

In combination with adjacent numbers, "three" means "a few." An oracle of judgment against Damascus says that only "two or three ripe olives" will be left on the tree (Isa. 17:6; cf. 2 K. 9:32; Jer. 36:23; Am. 1:3,6,9; etc.; cf. also the numerical proverbs in Prov. 30:15,18,21). An Ugaritic text uses the striking sequence "on the first day . . . on the second . . . on the third . . . on the fourth . . . on the seventh" to indicate a substantial period of time.[9] The same passage[10] says: "They journeyed a day and a second day, and after sunrise on the third day they arrived at Athirat's sanctuary."[11]

As examples of multiples of three, we note the following: Samson promises his guests thirty linen garments and thirty festal garments if they can solve his riddle (Jgs. 14:12); three hundred foxes suffer violence at his hands (15:4). To decorate the House of the Forest of Lebanon, Solomon orders the making of three hundred shields of beaten gold (1 K. 10:17), for which three hundred shekels of gold are used (2 Ch. 9:16). A mark of wealth is the impressive number of three thousand sheep that Nabal owns (1 S. 25:2); a mark of wisdom is the three thousand proverbs that Solomon composed (1 K. 5:12[4:32]).[12] Several texts speak of the tactical division of the army into three companies (*rā'šîm*,[13] Jgs. 7:16,20; 9:43; 1 S. 11:11; 13:17; cf. also Job 1:17).

e. *Humans*. When the text speaks of human beings, the hundredfold and thousandfold multiple of three usually refers to troops (Jgs. 7:6-7, three hundred; Josh. 7:4, three thousand; 1 S. 11:8, thirty or three hundred thousand). The numbers three and thirty, by contrast, are associated with the family: Noah has three sons (Gen. 6:10; cf. 1 S. 2:21; 2 S. 14:17; in a Phoenician inscription a grandmother dedicates a monument with statues of her three grandsons to their well-being[14]). The "minor judge" Ibzan has thirty sons and thirty daughters (Jgs. 12:9); Abdon has thirty grandsons (12:14).

In the social realm we note the following. Three strangers appear to Abraham (Gen. 18:2). Saul encounters three pilgrims (1 S. 10:3). Two or three witnesses are needed in a criminal trial (Dt. 17:6; 19:15). Job is visited by three friends (Job 2:11; 32:1); he himself is one of the "three righteous men," together with Noah and David (Ezk. 14:14,16,29; cf. also Dnl. 3:12ff., the "three men in the blazing furnace," and 6:3[2], the three officials appointed over the satraps). The groups of the "three" and the "thirty" associated with David require separate treatment.[15]

---

9. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 24-33.
10. *KTU* 1.14, IV, 31.
11. See also *KTU* 1.20, II, 5-6; 1.22, II, 24-26; A. Aitken, *UF* 19 (1987) 1-10.
12. → משל *māšāl*.
13. → ראש *rō'š*.
14. *KAI* 40.3-4.
15. See II.3.a below.

f. *Actions.* Threefold repetition of an action is a narrative motif. For example, Balaam strikes his donkey three times (Nu. 22:28), and Samson gives a deceptive answer three times (Jgs. 16:15). The threefold action clearly has a magical element: contrary to his charge, Balaam blesses the people of Israel three times (Nu. 24:10); Elijah stretches himself three times upon the widow's dead child to restore him to life (1 K. 17:21); at Elijah's command Joash strikes the ground three times with an arrow, to signify that he will defeat the Arameans three times (2 K. 13:18-19). Finally, Israel is to celebrate three great festivals each year (Ex. 23:14-17; 34:23-24), and Daniel prays three times every day (Dnl. 6:11,14[10,13]). There are also cases in which an action is performed three times without explicit mention of the number three.[16]

2. *Verb.* The verb *šlš* (piel and pual), derived from the word meaning "three," denotes a variety of actions (cf. Akk. *šalāšu,* "do something for the third time"[17]). Dt. 19:3 directs that the land be divided into three regions, each of which is to contain a city of refuge. During the contest on Mt. Carmel, Elijah has water poured three times on the altar, including the wood and the sacrificial animal, in order to demonstrate convincingly the superiority of Yahweh (1 K. 18:34; cf. Sir. 48:3).

The pual participle can mean "three years old" (Gen. 15:9; possible also: "from the third litter"[18]) and "three-storied" or "rising in the three stages" (Ezk. 42:6).[19] A "cord braided of three strands" (Eccl. 4:12) is a sign of strength: only when people preserve solidarity and help one another can they prevail.

The meaning of 1 S. 20:19 is uncertain. The translations offer a choice between "do something for the third time"[20] and "do something on the third day."[21]

3. *Derivatives.* a. *šālîš.* There are three senses of *šālîš.* In Isa. 40:12 and Ps. 80:6(5) a *šālîš* (I) denotes a measure that can hold the "dust of the earth" or a flood of tears. Its capacity was well known and is therefore not stated,[22] but it cannot have been very great, since Isa. 40:12 uses it in parallel with a "hollow of a hand" *(šōʿal),* a "span" *(zereṯ),* and a "balance" *(mōʾzᵉnayim).*

Quite uncertain is the nature of the musical instrument called a *šālîš* (II) in 1 S. 18:6. Sendrey rejects the derivation of this noun from *šlš* and proposes instead a kind of "shaking or rattling instrument," arguing that the word is onomatopoetic.[23] Seidel, by contrast, suggests three possibilities: "1. Three strings: three-stringed lute; 2. Three

16. Delling, 217.

17. *AHw,* III, 1146.

18. *GesB,* 838.

19. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 394; G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (1955), 236; Busink, *Tempel,* II, ill. 185.

20. H. J. Stoebe, *Erste Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 371, 376, citing 1 K. 18:34.

21. W. Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis. HKAT* I/4 (1902), 105-6; K. Budde, *Samuel. KHC* VIII (1902), 143, citing v. 20.

22. *GesB,* 834; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 199.

23. P. 383.

sides: triangle; 3. Triangular: harp," and opts for the first.[24] This option is supported by Galling,[25] although he also considers a sistrum.[26]

Another *šālîš* (III) clearly denotes some kind of military function or rank; it occurs both in the plural, referring to an occupational group (Ex. 14:7; 15:4 [1QM 11:10]; 1 K. 9:22//2 Ch. 8:9; 2 K. 10:25; Ezk. 23:15,23), and in the singular, referring to an individual (e.g., 2 K. 7:2); in two cases the individual is named: 2 K. 9:25 (Bidkar); 15:25: Pekah.

The derivation of this word from the numeral suggests that it may denote the third man of a chariot team[27] (in Akkadian the third man in a chariot is called *tašlīšu*[28]). Mastin,[29] however, cites many texts and arguments that cast doubt on this identification and even the very association of the *šālîš* with the chariotry.[30]

If we maintain the association of the numeral *šālôš* with the military office of *šālîš*, another possibility is that it denotes a rank: after the king[31] and his commanders[32] comes the "third rank,"[33] the *šālîš*, an officer for special assignments, who may serve as an individual (e.g., as the king's adjutant, 2 K. 7:2; 9:25; 15:25) or as part of a group (Ex. 14:7; 15:4; 2 K. 10:25). He enjoys special privileges (1 K. 9:22//2 Ch. 8:9) and is credited with an imposing appearance (Ezk. 23:15,23).

Other explanations have been proposed by Schley, who sees in the *šālîš* a member of a three-man squad; by Margalith and Vervenne, who derive the word from Ugar. *ṯlṯ*, "bronze," in the sense of a "bronzed man, i.e., an armoured knight"; and by Hehn, who suggests a Babylonian etymology that leads to the meaning "the third man is the mighty warrior, the hero."[34] Still others have attempted to explain *šālîš* as a loanword from Hittite or Egyptian.[35]

For the narratives of "David's warriors" (2 S. 23//1 Ch. 11), the foregoing discussion (despite significant textual difficulties) suggests the following interpretation: Subordinate to David's commander-in-chief Joab stands the group of the "Three," "officers of third rank" (1 S. 23:8-12,18-23), clearly distinguished from the group of the "Thirty," who may reflect an Egyptian model.[36] Possibly the Hittite Uriah, listed among the Thirty (2 S. 23:39), was later promoted to *šālîš:* his house is close to the royal palace (2 S. 11:3-4), and he is entrusted with a militarily demanding task, the storming of the Ammonite capital (vv. 14-25).

---

24. P. 69.
25. K. Galling, *BRL*², 235-36.
26. For an illustration, see H. Hickmann, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* XII (1965), 734; see also *HAL,* II, 1525.
27. H. Weippert, *BRL*², 253; de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 122, 223; Donner, 275-77.
28. *AHw,* III, 1339.
29. P. 131.
30. As claimed, e.g., by M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 217.
31. → מלך *meleḵ.*
32. → שׂר *śār.*
33. Mastin, 153-54.
34. P. 70.
35. For discussion see Mastin, 143-48.
36. Elliger, 66-67, 109-10.

In Middle Hebrew, *šālîš* is stripped of its military meaning and denotes "a trustee chosen by two parties to carry out an action for the benefit of one or the other party." From the noun is derived a hiphil verb meaning "place a matter in the hands of a trustee (lit. a third party)."[37]

The meaning of *šālîš* in Prov. 22:20 is disputed. Gesenius considers the translation "pithy saying"[38] but finally favors extensive emendation of the text.[39] Today most exegetes support the reading *šᵉlôšîm*, "thirty," referring to the thirty sayings of the collection in which this verse appears, which collection seems to be based on an Egyptian model.[40]

b. *šilšôm*. The expression *šilšôm* is a contraction of the numeral three *(šālôš)* and *yôm*, "day"[41] (cf. Akk. *šalšūmī*[42]); it is always linked with *'eṯmôl/tᵉmôl*, "yesterday." Its meaning is ambiguous: it can refer to either a short or a long interval of time.

Laban's change of attitude toward Jacob comes rapidly and unexpectedly (Gen. 31:2,5), and the added burden imposed by the Egyptians takes the Israelites who are doing forced labor by surprise (Ex. 5:7-8,14). After the Israelites cross the Jordan, its waters return as before (Josh. 4:18); just a few days before Saul's anointing as king and subsequent prophetic ecstasy, everyone knew him as the son of a simple farmer (1 S. 10:11; cf. also 19:7).

On the other hand, Ex. 4:10 refers to a lengthy period of time: Moses had never been able to speak eloquently, either as a young man or after his call. In Ex. 21:19, similarly, the owner of an ox has always known that it was accustomed to gore but has failed to restrain it and therefore is punished for what happens. Political opposition movements also form over lengthy periods; even when Saul was king, there was widespread sympathy for David within his realm, until finally there was a move to offer him legal sovereignty (2 S. 3:17; 5:2).

In combination with *lō'*, the expression means "never before." Whoever kills someone accidentally, although there has never been enmity between them, has the right to seek asylum (Dt. 4:42; 19:4,6; Josh. 20:5). Israel had never before traveled the route to the promised land (Josh. 3:4; cf. Ruth 2:11: Ruth came to a people she had not known before). The Philistines had never before seen the ark come into the camp of the Israelites (1 S. 4:7) and are therefore terrified.

c. *šillēšîm*. The meaning of *šillēšîm* is clearly "the third generation" (LXX *trítē geneá*). One lexicon obviously counts the children as the first (i.e., next) generation and therefore translates *šillēšîm* as "great-grandchildren";[43] another translates it as "grand-

37. *WTM*, IV, 568.

38. Cf. A. Meinhold, *Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), II, 374 n. 113: "The *Qere* means 'elite warriors' in the figurative sense of 'excellent things,' 'pithy sayings.'"

39. *GesB*, 834.

40. E.g., O. Eissfeldt, *OT: Intro.* (Eng. tr. 1965), 474-75; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (²1963), 84; Meinhold, *Sprüche*, II, 374.

41. *HAL*, II, 1545-46.

42. *AHw*, III, 1150.

43. *GesB*, 1430.

children."[44] Thus the punishment for the parents' transgression of the commandments is inflicted on the children as the second generation, the grandchildren as the third, and the great-grandchildren as the fourth generation (Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Nu. 14:18; Dt. 5:9).

In Gen. 50:23 *bānîm* must be understood in the general sense of "descendants" ("Joseph saw Ephraim's descendants of the third generation," i.e., grandchildren), since the parallel in v. 23b speaks of the children of Joseph's grandchild Machir.[45]

4. *Personal Names.* It is unclear whether the two PNs *šēleš* (1 Ch. 7:35) and *šilšâ* (7:37) are connected with our root *šlš*. Noth considers the meaning "triplet" or "third child" (cf. the Babylonian PN *i-ša-li-iš-ilum,* "God will give a third son"[46]), but rejects it as "less likely," in favor of a derivation from Arab. *salis,* "obedient, gentle."[47]

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. The use of numerals based on "three" in the Dead Sea Scrolls follows OT usage.

a. *Quantity.* Quantities are especially common in the War Scroll, the Temple Scroll, and the Copper Scroll (e.g., 1QM 9:12,14; 11QT 5:3; 3Q15 1:14; 4:8; etc.).

b. *Distance.* As in the OT, distances are often stated in terms of days: sacrificial animals within a three days' walk from the sanctuary must be sacrificed there (11QT 52:13-16). The punishment of exclusion from the community may last for thirty days or three months: "whoever lies down and goes to sleep in the session of the Many, thirty days . . . and whoever falls asleep up to three times during a session shall be punished ten days . . . and the person who spits in the course of a session of the Many shall be punished thirty days . . . and whoever giggles inanely with a loud voice shall be sentenced to thirty days" (1QS 7:10-15).

Also as in the OT, the thirtieth year of life represents an important turning point.[48] The priests responsible for administration must be between thirty and sixty years of age (CD 14:6); the cavalry described in 1QM 6:13-14 comprises men hardened in battle and trained in horsemanship from thirty to forty-five years old, while those who "despoil the fallen and loot and cleanse the earth, who protect the weapons and prepare the supplies shall be between twenty-five and thirty years old" (1QM 7:2-3).

c. *Objects.* We also find *šlš* associated with objects and architectural features in the Temple Scroll (11QT 9:4,8: the lampstand?; 40:11-12: gates; 46:16-18: "and you shall make three zones to the east of the city, separate from each other, where lepers, those who suffer gonorrhea, and those who have had an emission must go").

There is also a triad with religious significance: the "three snares of Belial with which he catches Israel," namely fornication, wealth, and defilement of the temple (CD 4:15-18).

---

44. *HAL,* II, 1546.

45. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 208; H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. tr. Macon, 1997), 465.

46. *AHw,* III, 1146.

47. *IPN,* 229 n. 1; cf. *HAL,* II, 1545.

48. See II.1.c above.

d. *Other.* Division into three companies for battle (1QM 6:1; 8:4; cf. Jgs. 7:16,20, etc.) is also found. The battle between the "sons of light and sons of darkness" runs its course in twice three "lots" (*gôrālôṯ* = "passages of arms") (1QM 1:13). Again, an inquiry into a transgression requires two or three witnesses (11QT 61:7; 64:8; cf. Dt. 17:6; 19:15). The community council consists of twelve men, among whom three priests are singled out (1QS 8:1).

IV. LXX. In almost every passage with the root *šlš,* the LXX uses a word with *tri-* to render the Hebrew word. Some exceptions are Isa. 40:12 (*šālîš* I = *dráx,* "span"), Ps. 80:6(5) (*šālîš* I = *métron,* "measure"), 2 Ch. 8:9 *(šālîš* III = *árchontes kaí dynatoí),* Ex. 5:8 *(šilšôm = kath' hekástēn hēméran),* 1 S. 18:6 *(šālîš* II = *kýmbalon).*

The translation of *šilšôm* is *trítē hēméra; šillēšîm* is represented by *trítē geneá.* For *šālîš* II we find *tristátēs* or *tríssos* (explained as "third after the king and queen"[49]). For the piel of the verb we find *trimerízein* (Dt. 19:3), *trisseúein* (1 S. 20:19), *trissoún* (1 K. 18:34); the pual participle is represented by *trietízein* (Gen. 15:19), *triploús* (Ezk. 42:6), and *éntritos* (Eccl. 4:12). For a period of three days we find *tritaíos* (1 S. 9:20) or *triēmería* (Am. 4:4); for three months, *trímēnon* (Gen. 38:24); for three years, *trietḗs* (2 Ch. 31:16).

Beyse

49. F. Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (Göttingen, 1989), 290.

שֵׁם *šēm*

I. General. II. 1. Distribution; 2. Lexical Field. III. Usage: 1. Verbless Clauses; 2. Verbs of Speaking; 3. Verbs of Perception; 4. Verbs of Emotion; 5. Verbs of Trusting; 6. Verbs of Motion; 7. Verbs of Building, Setting, Resting; 8. Verbs of Destruction; 9. Other Verbs; 10. With *lᵉmaʿan.* IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šēm. A. Aikhenwald, "Some Names of Officials in the Later Books of the OT," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* 3 (1985) 58-65 (Russian); A. Alt, "Menschen ohne Namen," *ArOr* 18 (1950) 9-24 = *KlSchr* III (²1968), 198-213; A. Archi, ed., *Eblaite Personal Names and Semitic Name-Giving* (Rome, 1988); W. Aufrecht, "Surrogates for the Divine Names in the Palestine Targums to Exodus" (diss., Toronto, 1979); A. Avigad, "שמות חדשים בחותמות עבריים," *FS N. Glueck. ErIsr* 12 (1975) 66-71; idem, "On the Identification of Persons Mentioned in Hebrew Epigraphic

Sources," *FS M. Avi-Yonah. ErIsr* 19 (1987) 235-37 (Heb.); T. Baarda, "De Namen van de kinderen van Levi," *Amsterdamse cahiers voor exegese en bijbelse theologie* 8 (1987) 87-107; K. Baltzer, "Namenglaube. II, Im AT," *RGG*[3], IV, 1302-4; J. Barr, "The Symbolism of Names in the OT," *BJRL* 52 (1969/70) 11-29; H. M. Barstad, "The OT Feminine Personal Name *rāḥāb*," *SEÅ* 54 (1989) 43-49; J. Bauer, "Ortsnamen in den frühen Texten aus Ur," *WO* 18 (1987) 5-6; Benz; A.-M. Besnard, *Le mystère du nom. LD* 35 (1962); H. Bietenhard, "Name," *BHHW*, II, 1284-86; idem, "ὄνομα," *TDNT*, V, 242-83; S. H. Blank, "Traces of Prophetic Agony in Isaiah," *HUCA* 27 (1956) 81-92; H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 ([2]1970), esp. 166-68; J. Boehmer, *Das biblische "Im Namen"* (Giessen, 1898); P. A. H. de Boer, "2 Samuel 12:25," *Studia biblica et semitica. FS T. C. Vriezen* (Wageningen, 1966), 25-29; R. Borger, "Gen IV 1," *VT* 9 (1959) 85-86; H. A. Brongers, "Die Partikel לְמַעַן in der biblisch-hebräischen Sprache," *OTS* 18 (1973) 84-96; idem, "De Wendung *b*ᵉ*šēm jhwh* im AT," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 1-20; C. Cannuyer, "A propos de l'origine du nom de la Syrie," *JNES* 44 (1985) 133-37; H. Cazelles, "Onomastique," *DBS*, VI, 732-44; B. S. Childs, "A Study of the Formula 'Until this Day,'" *JBL* 82 (1963) 279-82; R. E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," *VT* 15 (1965) 300-312; idem, *God and Temple* (1965); D. J. A. Clines, "X, X *ben* Y, *ben* Y, Personal Names in Hebrew Narrative Style," *VT* 22 (1972) 266-87; A. Cohen, "שמות אתרים שיסודם בצבע הסביבה," *BethM* 18 (1972/73) 420-28; M. D. Coogan, "More Yahwistic Names in the Murashu Documents," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 199-200; idem, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents. HSM* 7 (1976); J. L. Crenshaw, "Amos and the Theophanic Tradition," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 203-15; idem, "*YHWH ṣ*ᵉ*ba'ôt š*ᵉ*mô*," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 156-75; J. A. Delaunay, "Remarques sur quelques noms de personne des archives élamites de Persépolis," *Studia Iranica* 5 (1976) 9-31; G. Delling, "Biblisch-jüdische Namen im hellenistisch-römischen Ägypten," *Bulletin de la société d'archéologie copte* 22 (1974/75) 1-42; S. Dempster, "The Lord Is His Name," *RB* 98 (1991) 170-89; R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f," *VT* 13 (1963) 34-51; B. J. Diebner, "Erwägungen zur Namensform 'Juda' *yhwdh y*ᵉ*hūdāh*," *DBAT* 25 (1988) 49-73; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Ortsnamen *gt'ṯtrt* und *'ṯtrt//hdr'yl*," *UF* 22 (1990) 55-56; R. A. Di Vito, "Studies in Third Millennium Sumerian and Akkadian Onomastics," *HTR* 80 (1987) 479-80; C. Dohmen, "'Eifersüchtiger ist sein Name' (Ex 34,14)," *TZ* 46 (1990) 289-304; F. Dumermuth, "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen," *ZAW* 70 (1958) 59-98; W. Eichrodt, "Der Name des Bundesgottes" = "The Name of the Covenant God," *Theology of the OT. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1961-67), I, 178-205; W. Eilers, *Sinn und Herkunft der Planetennamen. SBAW* 5 (1975); O. Eissfeldt, "Gottesnamen in Personennamen als Symbole menschlicher Qualitäten," *FS W. Baetke* (1966), 110-17 = *KlSchr*, IV (1968), 276-284; idem, "'Gut Glück!' in semitischer Namengebung," *JBL* 82 (1963) 195-200 = *KlSchr*, IV (1968), 73-78; idem, "Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 42 (1927) 161-80 = *KlSchr*, I (1962), 150-71; idem, "Umnennungen im AT," in P. R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars, eds., *Words and Meanings. FS D. Winton Thomas* (Cambridge, 1968), 69-79 = *KlSchr*, V (1973), 68-76; K. Elliger, "Ich bin der Herr, euer Gott," *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. FS K. Heim* (Hamburg, 1954), 9-34 = *KlSchr. ThB* 32 (1966), 211-31; F. M. Fales, "West Semitic Names from the Governor's Palace," *Annali de Ca'Foscari* 13 (1974) 179-88; L. H. Feldman, "Some Observations on the Name of Palestine," *HUCA* 61 (1990) 1-23; J. Fichtner, "Die etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des AT," *VT* 6 (1956) 372-96; J. D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. JSOTSup* 49 (1988); M. V. Fox, "Egyptian Onomastica and Biblical Wisdom," *VT* 36 (1986) 302-10; H. Freydank, *Nuove attestazioni dell'onomastica medio-assira. Incunabula Graeca* 14 (1979); idem, "Theophore Elemente in den Personennamen mittelassyrischer Urkunden," *Or* 45 (1976) 178-81; K. Galling, "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel," *TLZ* 81 (1956) 65-70; M. Garsiel, *Biblical Names* (1991); idem, *Midrashic Name Derivations in the Bible* (1987); idem, "Puns Upon Names as a Literary Device in 1 Kings 1–2," *Bibl* 72 (1991) 379-86; R. Giveon, *The Impact of Egypt on Canaan. OBO* 20 (1978), esp. 15-21; idem,

"Nakhman," *Revue d'égyptologie* 28 (1976) 155-56; M. Görg, "Aaron," *BN* 32 (1986) 11-17; idem, "Ein Frauenname des 7. Jahrhunderts," *BN* 33 (1986) 17-20; idem, "Goliat aus Gat," *BN* 34 (1986) 17-21; idem, "Hagar, die Ägypterin," *BN* 33 (1986) 17-20; idem, "Namen und Titel in 1 Kön 11,19f," *BN* 36 (1987) 22-26; idem, "Zum judäischen Personennamen MY'MN," *BN* 38/39 (1987) 33-35; idem, "Zum Namen des Fürsten von Taanach," *BN* 41 (1988) 15-18; A. D. Goldberg, "Northern-Type Names in the Post-Exilic Jewish Onomasticon" (diss., Brandeis, 1973); R. Gordis, "Personal Names in Ruth," *Judaism* 35 (1986) 298-99; O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im AT. BZAW* 64 (1934); F. Gröndahl, *PNU;* R. Hachlili, "Names and Nicknames of Jews in Second Temple Times," in J. Aviram et al., eds., *FS A. J. Brawer. ErIsr* 17 (1984) 188-211 (Heb.); D. M. Harduf, *Biblical Proper Names* (Toronto, 1979); R. Harris, "Notes on the Slave Names in the Old Babylonian Sippar," *JCS* 29 (1977) 46-52; C. M. Harrison, "Persian Names on Coins of Northern Anatolia," *JNES* 41 (1982) 181-94; W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu. FRLANT* 2 (1903); J. Heller, "Der Name Eva," *ArOr* 26 (1958) 636-56 = *An der Quelle des Lebens. BEATAJ* 10 (1988), 83-103; idem, "Namengebung und Namendeutung," *EvT* 27 (1967) 255-66 = *Quelle* 71-82; idem, "Ursprung des Namens Israel," *CV* 7 (1964) 263-64 = *Quelle,* 105-6; M. Heltzer, "Addenda to: Extra-Biblical Tradition of Hebrew Personal Names," in B. Oded, ed., *Studies in the History of the Jewish People,* V (Haifa, 1980), 57-62; idem and M. Ohana, *The Extra-Biblical Tradition of Hebrew Personal Names* (Haifa, 1978); S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im AT. BWANT* 85 (1965), esp. 130-40; R. S. Hess, "Cultural Aspects of Onomastic Distribution in the Amarna Texts," *UF* 21 (1989) 209-16; idem, "Divine Names in the Amarna Texts," *UF* 18 (1986) 149-68; idem, "Personal Names from Amarna," *UF* 17 (1985) 157-67; J. Hobbins, "Il nome del profeta Abacuc," *RivB* 35 (1987) 307-11; K. Hoffmann, "Die Ortsnamen-Parenthese im Altpersischen und Vedischen," *ZDMG* 110 (1960) 64-73; A. M. Honeyman, "The Evidence for Regnal Names Among the Hebrews," *JBL* 67 (1948) 13-25; W. Horbury, "The Name Mardochaeus in a Ptolemaic Inscription," *VT* 41 (1991) 220-26; R. L. Hubbard, "Ruth IV 17, a New Solution," *VT* 38 (1988) 293-301; H. B. Huffmon, *APNM;* W. Huss, "Die punischen Namen der nordafrikanischen Städte Hippon Diarrhythos und Hippo Regius," *Sem* 38 (1990) 171-74; T. Ilan, "Notes on the Distribution of Jewish Women's Names in Palestine in the Second Temple and Mishnaic Period," *JJS* 40 (1989) 186-200; F. Israel, "Quelques précisions sur l'onomastique hébraïque féminine dans l'épigraphie," *SEL* 4 (1987) 79-92; B. Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes* (Berlin, 1903); C. H. W. Johns, *The Religious Significance of Semitic Proper Names. John Bohlen Lectures* 1910 (Cambridge, 1912); A. R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff, [2]1961), esp. 17-19; B. C. Kaganoff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Names and Their History* (London, 1978); S. E. Kaladzakis, *Etymology and Theological Interpretation of Biblical Names on the Basis of Onomastica Sacra. Analecta Vlatadon* 41 (Thessaloniki, 1983) (Gk.); A. Kempinski, "Some Philistine Names from the Kingdom of Gaza," *IEJ* 37 (1987) 20-24; E. K. Kim, "Who Is Yahweh?" *Asia Journal of Theology* 3 (1989) 108-17; G. Kittel, *Der Name über alle Namen. Biblisch-theologische Schwerpunkte* 2 (1989); A. Klawek, "The Name Jahweh in the Light of Most Recent Discussion," *FO* 27 (1990) 11-12; idem, "Les noms hébraïques 'Jahveh' et 'Elohim,'" *FO* 27 (1990) 5-9; E. A. Knauf, "Eine nabatäische Parallele zum hebräischen Gottesnamen," *BN* 23 (1984) 21-28; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 209-10; W. Kornfeld, "Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Namensforschung," in A. Caquot and M. Delcor, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 213-18; idem, *Onomastica aramaica aus Ägypten. Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft* 333 (1978); C. J. Labuschagne, *Schriftprophetie en Volksideologie* (Nijkerk, 1968); M.-J. Lagrange, "The Revealed Form of the Divine Name," *Exégète à Jérusalem. CahRB* 29 (1991), 179-89; W. G. Lambert, "The Name of Nergal Again," *ZA* 80 (1990) 40-52; idem, "The Names of Umma," *JNES* 49 (1990) 40-52; R. Lawton, "Israelite Personal Names on Pre-Exilic Hebrew Inscriptions," *Bibl* 65 (1984) 330-46; S. C. Layton, *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible. HSM* 47 (1900); F. T. M. de Liagre Böhl, "Die fünfzig Namen

des Marduk," *AfO* 11 (1934) 191-218 = *Opera minora* (1953), 282-312, 504-8; S. J. Lieberman, "The Names of the Cuneiform Graphemes in Old Babylonian," *Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 19 (1977) 147-59; E. Lipiński, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics. OLA* 1 (1975); J. M. Lochman, "Die Vorstellung des Namens Gottes im Dekalog als Begründung einer Ethik der Freiheit," *TZ* 34 (1978) 257-64; idem, *Wegweisung der Freiheit* (1979), esp. 19-29, 41-52; N. Lohfink, "Die priesterschriftliche Abwertung der Tradition von der Offenbarung des Yahwenamens an Mose," *Bibl* 49 (1968), 1-8 = *Studien zum Pentateuch. SBAB* 4 (1988), 71-78; B. O. Long, *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the OT. BZAW* 108 (1968); O. Loretz, "Die babylonischen Gottesnamen Sukkut und Kajjamānu in Amos 5,26," *ZAW* 101 (1989) 286-89; M. Lubetzki, "*šm* as a Deity," *Religion* 17 (1987) 1-14; E. Lüddeckens, "*nḥsj* und *kš* in ägyptischen Personennamen," in E. Endesfelder et al., eds., *Ägypten und Nubien* (1977), 283-91; M. Lutz-Bachmann, ed., *Gottesnamen* (1992); R. M. Mackowski, "Some 'New' Place in Names in Herodian Jerusalem," *BZ* 29 (1985) 262-66; M. Maraqten, *Die semitischen Personennamen in den alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften aus Vorderasien. Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik* 5 (Hildesheim, 1988); O. Margalith, "On the Origin and Antiquity of the Name 'Israel'," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 225-37; idem, "Postscript to My Article 'On the Origin and Antiquity of the Name "Israel,"'" *ZAW* 103 (1991) 274; E. Masson, "Les premiers noms sémitiques à Chypre," *Sem* 39 (1990) 41-42; O. Masson, "Libyca," *Sem* 25 (1975) 75-85; 27 (1977) 41-45; idem, "Noms sémitiques dans deux inscriptions grecques," *Sem* 26 (1976) 93-98; M. Mayrhofer, ed., *Iranisches Personennamenbuch,* I/1: *Die avestischen Namen* (Vienna, 1977); idem, *Zum Namengut des Avesta* (Vienna, 1977); S. D. McBride Jr., "The Deuteronomic Name Theology" (diss., Harvard, 1969); J. M. G. McConville, "God's 'Name' and God's 'Glory,'" *TynB* 30 (1979) 149-63; A. Meinhold, "Jüdische Stimmen zum Dritten Gebot," *Kirche und Israel* 2 (1987) 159-68; Z. Meshel and C. Meyers, "The Name of God in the Wilderness of Zin," *BA* 39 (1976) 6-10; T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. CBOT* 18 (1982); J. T. Milik, "Les papyrus araméens d'Hermoupolis et les cultes syro-phéniciens en Égypte perse," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 546-622; A. R. Millard, "Assyrian Royal Names in Biblical Hebrew," *JSS* 21 (1976) 1-14; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,* 2 vols. (1927), esp. I, 423-42; S. Morenz, "Ägyptische und davididische Königstitulatur," *ZÄS* 49 (1954) 73-74; A. Murtonen, *Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting, A: Proper Names. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics* 13 (Leiden, 1986); J. Naveh, "Miscellanea Onomastica Hebraica," *Sem* 39 (1990) 59-62; idem, "Nameless People," *IEJ* 40 (1990) 108-23; E. Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen* (Schaan, 1983); G. Neumann, "Zu einigen hethitischen-luwischen Personennamen," *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 90 (1977) 139-44; E. W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford, 1967), esp. 55-56, 71-73; T. Nöldeke, "*Sim* 'Name,'" *NBSS,* 140-43; S. I. L. Norin, *Sein Name allein ist hoch. CBOT* 24 (1986); M. Noth, "Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels," *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959. SVT* 7 (1960), 262-82; idem, *IPN;* O. Odelain and R. Séguineau, *Dictionnaire des noms propres de la Bible* (Paris, 1978); M. Ophra, "Is There a Grammar of *šᵉmôt yiššûbîm?*" *Leš* 50 (1985/86) 1-30, 137-50; J. Parlebas, "Sur l'origine de la valeur *ḏḥwty* de . . . ," *GMA* 15 (1975) 39-43; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, esp. 245-59; G. Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum* (Stuttgart, 1967), esp. 71-72; W. Philipp, "Name Gottes," *RGG*³, IV, 1298-1300; A. J. Poulter and G. I. Davies, "The Samaria Ostraca," *VT* 40 (1990) 237-40; H. D. Preuss, *OT Theology,* I. OTL (Eng. tr. 1995), esp. 139-51, 170-71; O. Procksch, *ThAT* (1950), esp. 436-54; É. Puech, "Abécédaire et liste alphabétique des noms hébreux du début du IIᵉ s.A.D.," *RB* 87 (1980) 118-26; G. von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien. FRLANT* 58 (1947) = *GSAT. ThB* 48 (1973), 109-53, esp. 127-32; idem, *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium. BWANT* 47 (1929) = *GSAT,* 9-73, esp. 36-45; idem, "The Royal Ritual in Judah," *Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. tr. New York, 1966), 222-31, esp. 229; Y. T. Radday, "Vom Humor in biblischen Ortsnamen," in M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck, eds., *Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden. BEATAJ* 13 (1988), 431-46; G. W. Ramsey, "Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Genesis 2:23 and Elsewhere?" *CBQ* 50

(1988) 24-35; H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (Glückstadt, 1935-52); I. Rapaport, "The Hebrew Word *Shēm*," *DD* 10 (1982) 144-56; idem, *The Hebrew Word Shēm and Its Original Meaning* (Melbourne, 1976); M. Reisel, *The Mysterious Name of Y.H.W.H.* (Assen, 1957); R. V. Reiterer, "Markierte und nicht markierte direkte Objekte bei Ben Sira," in W. Gross et al., eds., *Texte, Methode und Grammatik. FS W. Richter* (St. Ottilien, 1991), 359-78, esp. 361-62; R. Rendtorff, "The Concept of Revelation in Ancient Israel," in W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History* (Eng. tr. New York, 1968), 23-53; H. Graf Reventlow, *Gebot und Predigt im Dekalog* (Gütersloh, 1962), esp. 44-45; G. Rinaldi, "*bᵉšēm* (Gen 21,33)," *BeO* 25 (1983) 242; R. R. Robinson, "Literary Functions of the Genealogies of Genesis," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 598-608; J. Ronning, "The Naming of Isaac," *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991) 1-27; H. P. Rüger, "Thomas Müntzers Erklärung hebräischer Eigennamen und der Liber de interpretatione hebraicorum nominum des Hieronymus," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 94 (1983) 83-87; L. Ruppert, "'Machen wir uns einen Namen . . .' (Gen 11,4)," in R. Mosis and L. Rappaport, eds., *Der Weg zum Menschen. FS A. Deissler* (Freiburg, 1989), 28-45; E. Ruprecht, "Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der einzelnen Elemente von Gen XX 2-3," *VT* 29 (1979) 444-64, esp. 451-54; G. Ryckmans, *Noms propres sud-sémitiques*, 3 vols. (Leiden, 1934-35); S. Ṣamaryon, "Tradition of Extrabiblical Hebrew Names," *BethM* 26 (1980/81) 309-10 (Heb.); C. Saporetti, *Onomastica Medio-Assira I, Nomi di Persona. StPohl* 6 (1970); M. Sartre, "Sur quelques noms sémitiques relevés en Mauretanie tingitane," *Antiquités Africaines* 9 (1975) 153-56; A. Saviv, "About Some Scriptural Divine Designations," *DD* 15 (1986/87) 29-37; idem, "Clarification of the Word *šēm* in the Bible," *BethM* 31 (1985)/86) 31-38 (Heb.); W. H. Schmidt, *Die Zehn Gebote im Rahmen alttestamentlicher Ethik. EdF* 281 (1993), esp. 78-85; W. Schottroff, *Gedenken im Alten Orient und im AT. WMANT* 15 (1964); K.-D. Schunck, "Der fünfte Thronname des Messias (Jes. IX 5-6)," *VT* 23 (1973) 108-10; M. Sekine, "Wort, Name und Geist im AT," *AJBI* 14 (1988) 3-9; S. de Simone, "Ancora sul nome di *Caere*," *Studi etruschi* 44 (1976) 163-84; W. von Soden, "*Aššuretellilāni, Sînšarriškum, Sînšum(u)līšer* und die Ereignisse im Assyrerreich nach 635 v. Chr.," *ZA* 58 (1967) 243-55; J. J. Stamm, *AN; idem, Beiträge zur hebräischen und altorientalischen Namenkunde. OBO* 30 (1980); idem, "Zur sprachlichen Form der 'ostkanaanäischen' Namen," *ZDPV* 65 (1942) 223-35; J. K. Stark, *PNPI;* R. R. Stieglitz, "The Hebrew Names of the Seven Planets," *JNES* 40 (1981) 135-37; M. W. Stolper, "A Note on Yahwistic Personal Names in the Murašû Texts," *BASOR* 222 (1976) 25-28; I. Tal, "The Greek Names of the Hasmoneans," *JQR* 78 (1987/88) 1-20; idem, "The Names of the Hasmoneans in the Second Temple Period," *FS M. Avi-Yonah. ErIsr* 19 (1987) 238-41 (Heb.); K. Tallqvist, *APN;* S. Talmon, "*Yād wāšēm*," *HS* 25 (1984) 8-17; S. Timm, "Anmerkungen zu vier neuen hebräischen Namen," *ZAH* 2 (1989) 188-98; P. J. Tomson, "The Names Israel and Jew in Ancient Judaism and in the NT," *Bijdragen* 47 (1986) 120-40, 266-89; M. Tsevat, "Ishboshet and Congeners," *HUCA* 46 (1975) 71-87; idem, "Die Namengebung Samuels und die Substitutionstheorie," *ZAW* 99 (1987) 250-54; A. N. Tucker, "What's in a Name?" *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica* 200 (1975) 471-77; J. A. Tvedtnes, "The Origin of the Name 'Syria,'" *JNES* 40 (1981) 139-40; J. H. Ulrichsen, "*YHWH mālāḵ*," *VT* 27 (1977) 361-74; R. de Vaux, "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Eng. tr. Garden City, 1967), 152-66; idem, "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom," in F. Maass, ed., *Das ferne und nahe Wort. FS L. Rost. BZAW* 105 (1967), 219-28; idem, "The Revelation of the Divine Name YHWH," in J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter, eds., *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (London, 1970), 48-75; L. Viganò, "Il fenomeno stilistico di *break-up* di nomi divini nei testi de Ras Šamra-Ugarit," *RivB* 24 (1976) 225-42; idem, *Nomi e titoli di Yhwh alla luce del semitico del Nord-ovest. BietOr* 31 (1976); G. Vittmann, "Zu den ägyptischen Entsprechungen aramäisch überlieferter Personennamen," *Or* 58 (1989) 213-29; G. Voet, *Bijdrage tot de studie der personsnamen van het oudbabylonische Sippar* (Gent, 1973); J. H. Walton, "Isa 7:14: What's in a Name?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987) 289-306; W. A. Ward, "Some Personal Names of the Hyksos Period Rulers and Notes on the Epigraphy of Their

I. General. The biradical noun *šēm* is Common Semitic. The theophoric personal names from Ebla (*šum-ra-bu*, "the name/son is great"[1]), Old Aramaic (*šmbʿl*, "name/scion of Baal"[2]), and the OT (*šᵉmûʾēl*, "name/scion of El," 1 S. 1:20[3]) show that at a very early date the root had substantial content, being more than just a term used, e.g., to differentiate among individuals.

II. 1. *Distribution.* The noun *šēm* occurs 778 times in the singular and 86 times in the plural, being found in every book of the OT except Obadiah, Jonah, and Haggai. There are 113 occurrences in Genesis, 43 in Exodus, 11 in Leviticus, 49 in Numbers, 36 in Deuteronomy, 12 in Joshua, 19 in Judges, 33 in 1 Samuel, 34 in 2 Samuel, 46 in 1 Kings, 23 in 2 Kings, 54 in Isaiah, 55 in Jeremiah, 28 in Ezekiel, 5 in Hosea, 2 in Joel, 7 in Amos, 4 in Micah, 1 in Nahum, 5 in Zephaniah, 7 in Zechariah, 10 in Malachi, 109 in the Psalms, 7 in Job, 7 in Proverbs, 14 in Ruth, 1 in the Song of Songs, 3 in Ecclesiastes, 1 in Lamentations, 8 in Esther, 6 in Daniel, 4 in Ezra, 7 in Nehemiah, 55 in 1 Chronicles, and 45 in 2 Chronicles, for a total of 864; there are also 33 occurrences in Sirach. A quick survey clearly shows a concentration in Genesis, Deuteronomy, and DtrH. In the prophets and Psalms *šēm* is often connected with human beings, but primarily with Yahweh. It is rarely used with things, and only once with animals.

Scarabs," *UF* 8 (1976) 353-69; J. P. Weinberg, "Gott im Weltbild des Chronisten," *ZAW 100 Sup* (1988) 170-89; H. Weippert, "'Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen,'" *BZ* 24 (1980) 76-94; C. Westermann, *Promises to the Fathers* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1980), 1-94, esp. 36-49; R. M. Whiting, "The Reading of the Divine Name ᵈNin-MAR-KI," *ZA* 75 (1985) 1-3; H. Wildberger, "Die Thronnamen des Messias, Jes 9,5b," *TZ* 16 (1960) 314-32; A. S. van der Woude, "שֵׁם *šēm* name," *TLOT,* III, 1348-67; R. Zadok, "Historical and Onomastic Notes IV: On Some Syro-Palestinian Names in Neo-Assyrian Transcription," *WO* 9 (1977/78) 53-56; idem, "Die nichthebräischen Namen der Israeliten vor dem hellenistischen Zeitalter," *UF* 17 (1985) 387-98; idem, "On Five Biblical Names," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 266-68; idem, "On Some Non-Semitic Names in the Ancient Near East," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 19 (1984) 385-89; idem, "On the Onomastic Material from Emar," *WO* 20/21 (1989/90) 45-61; idem, "On the Onomasticon of the Old Aramaic Sources," *BiOr* 48 (1991) 25-40; idem, "Some Jews in Babylonian Documents," *JQR* 74 (1983/84) 294-97; Y. Zakovitch, "Explicit and Implicit Name-Derivations," *HAR* 4 (1980) 167-81; Z. Zevit, "A Chapter in the History of Israelite Personal Names," *BASOR* 250 (1983) 1-16; idem, "Onomastic Gleanings from Recently Published Judahite Bullae," *IEJ* 38 (1988) 227-34; W. Zimmerli, "I Am Yahweh," *I Am Yahweh* (Eng. tr. Atlanta, 1982), 1-28; idem, "Knowledge of God According to the Book of Ezekiel," *I Am Yahweh,* 29-98; idem, "'Offenbarung' im AT," *EvT* 22 (1962), 15-32; idem, "Vier oder fünf Thronnamen des messianischen Herrschers von Jes. IX 5b.6," *VT* 22 (1972) 249-52.

1. H.-P. Müller in L. Cagni, ed., *La lingua di Ebla* (Naples, 1981), 217.

2. W. Kornfeld, "Neues über die phönikischen und aramäischen Graffiti in den Tempeln von Abydos," *Anzieger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 115, 11 (1978), 194-95.

3. See below.

2. *Lexical Field.* There are various ways of indicating a name. In the rare instances when *šēm* is used in the context of naming, there is a certain emphasis and solemnity in the announcement of the name. It is therefore easy to understand why *šēm* occurs frequently in etiologies and etymological explanations. In addition, *šēm* incorporates those elements that are associated with the particular person or Yahweh. Thus *šēm* comes to have semantic overtones of fame, honor, influence, power, etc. Furthermore, *šēm* functions as a substitute for the person in question (cf. the use of *haššēm* in Judaism as a substitute for the name "Yahweh"); this usage takes on particular importance in the theological domain.

Thus *šēm* constitutes a reality that guarantees the bearer an existence, however hard to define, that endures beyond death.[4] A related theme is defense against the ultimate annihilation of the *šēm*.[5] There are a very few instances where *šēm* approaches the meaning of the word "essence," but the claim that *šēm* describes a person's essence is not supported by the evidence.

The verbs used in clauses with *šēm* are rarely in the qal, but surprisingly often in the piel or hiphil. Dtn/Dtr rhetoric makes extensive use of the expressions *bānâ bayiṯ lišᵉmî, lihyôṯ šᵉmî šām, śym 'eṯ-šēm,* and *šakkēn šēm;*[6] it is noteworthy that the expression *śym šēm,* common in Deuteronomy, is adopted by both DtrH and ChrH, whereas *šakkēn šēm* is picked up only by the latter (cf. the significance of *šᵉḵînâ* in Judaism). Also striking is the concentration of *niqrā' šᵉmî/šimᵉḵā 'al* in Jeremiah[7] and the restriction of *nb'* (niphal) *bᵉšēm* to Jeremiah[8] and *ṭm' šēm* to Ezekiel.[9] With these exceptions, the distribution of *šēm* is so broad it would be extremely difficult to identify a usage specific to a particular textual strand.

Also worthy of emphasis is the fusion of *šēm* with peoples and deities.[10]

III. Usage.

1. *Verbless Clauses.* In verbless clauses *šēm* can play the role either of subject or predicate; the meaning derives from the interplay of the constitutive elements of the clause.

a. The verbless clause *'ēlleh šᵉmôṯ* (26 times: Ex. 1:1; Nu. 1:5; 3:2-3,18; etc.) always refers to specific names, but also has the function of presenting a group as the sum of individuals who bear different names.

b. Verbless clauses with singular pronominal suffixes encompass a broad semantic field, which ranges from the simple mention of a name in secular or theological texts to representing Yahweh through the theonym.

(1) The simple mention of a name is found only in the secular domain. Here Gen.

4. See III.6 and 8 below.
5. See III.8 below.
6. See III.7 below.
7. See III.2 below.
8. See III.8 below.
9. See III.8 below.
10. See III.2-4, 6-9 below.

2:19 is unique: the clause *hû' šemô* refers to a general naming without mentioning any personal name. The name is usually stated, e.g., *šemô lāḇān* (Gen. 24:29; cf. Gen. 38:1,2; Jgs. 13:2; 17:1; 1 S. 1:1; 9:1,2; 17:4,12,23; 21:8[Eng. 7]; 22:20; 2 S. 4:4; 9:12; 13:3; 16:5; 17:25; 20:1; 1 K. 13:2; Job 1:1; Ruth 2:1; 2 Ch. 28:9). The majority of occurrences are in Dtr passages. Nothing is said about the individual character and features of the person named. Only family relationships (cf. Jer. 37:13) and place of residence are mentioned, albeit rarely — e.g., "a man of the hill country of Ephraim, called Sheba *(šeḇaʿ . . . šemô),* a son of Bichri" (2 S. 20:21; cf. Est. 2:5). The use of *šemāh* plus a personal name to constitute a clause is a feature of elevated style introducing a name in a verbless clause (Gen. 16:1; 22:24; 25:1; 38:6; Josh. 2:1; Jgs. 16:4; 2 S. 3:7; 13:1; 14:27; 1 Ch. 2:26).

(2) The form *šemâ* appears once in the setting of a secular change of name (Jgs. 1:26). The name *(šemāh)* Sarah is enjoined by God in Gen. 17:15.

(3) It is common to interpret a name by means of an etymology. For example, Abigail explains the conduct of her husband on the basis of his name *(kî šemô ken-hû'),* which she interprets with a popular etymology: *nāḇāl šemô ûneḇālâ ʿimmô* (1 S. 25:25). As a result, personal characteristics may be associated with a name. The question remains, however, whether a name assigned by chance during childhood *(nāḇāl)* can embody its bearer's "essential nature," since the interpretation is attributed to an unforeseen encounter.

(4) A name often conveys information. When Prov. 21:24 says *lēṣ šemô,* it means that the person in question is the embodiment of what the name expresses, a "scoffer." In the postexilic period of reconstruction, the high priest Joshua is established as a symbol of hope and honored with a crown. The statement *ṣemaḥ šemô* (Zec. 6:12)[11] interprets his very person, since under him the people will "branch out" and the temple will be rebuilt. The *šēm* points to the function to be performed by the bearer of the name.

That a name may convey significant information about its bearer is shown by various encounters with "angels." While wrestling with Jacob, the being asks his name (Gen. 32:28[27]; cf. 35:10, with a different focus), which the "angel" then changes on his own authority. Manoah asks the *mal'aḵ yhwh, "mî šemeḵā?"* (Jgs. 13:17). When what the angel has promised comes to pass, he will respond with appropriate honor. But the angel refuses to tell his name.

The question *mah-šemô* asks for further information about the bearer of a name. In Ex. 3:13 Moses asks the question he expects the Israelites to ask, *mah-šemô,* to which Yahweh actually replies, "I-am-present," which in the context means that he will aid and support Moses — as well as the Israelites. In Ex. 34:14 Yahweh's claim to exclusive devotion is stated in absolute form: *yhwh qannā' šemô 'ēl qannā' hû'* ("Yahweh, Jealous is his name, a jealous God is he"), words that also clearly express the rejection of all polytheistic manifestation.

(5) Names serve to declare existence: Ps. 83:19(18) attaches great importance to the existence of Yahweh, expressed in two verbless clauses, *kî-'attâ* and *šimḵā yhwh.*

11. → XII, 412.

(6) A name signifies that its bearer is well known. In a bitter attack on the priests for failure to conduct the cult with proper respect and reverence, Yahweh points out that his name is great *(gāḏôl šᵉmî)* from the rising of the sun to its setting, i.e., it is prominent among all nations (Mal. 1:11). Here the prophet is alluding to the fame associated with the name Yahweh (cf. v. 14).

(7) Yahweh and his name are interchangeable. According to Ex. 3:14, when Moses asks who is the God with whom he has been speaking, Yahweh answered: *'ehyeh.* The name "Yahweh" is then given in v. 15, without any supporting argument, and finally the tradition of patriarchal worship is appended: *'ᵉlōhê 'ᵃḇōṯêḵem 'ᵉlōhê 'aḇrāhām 'ᵉlōhê yiṣḥāq wē'lōhê ya'ᵃqōḇ,* followed by the verbless clause *zeh-šᵉmî lᵉ'ōlām* as a statement of fact, in parallel with a second verbless clause, *wᵉzeh ziḵrî lᵉḏōr dōr.* In this theological context, in which the subject of Yahweh's concrete activity is of paramount importance, *šēm* embodies much more than a reference to a pronounceable name. Both *šēm* and *zēḵer* establish the presence of the one — namely, Yahweh — who enters the course of human events as liberator.

According to Ex. 23:20, Yahweh will send a *mal'āḵ.* The mention of this figure is a relic from pre-Israelite treaties, which were concluded in the presence of the gods, who in turn would enforce the treaty through blessings and curses. The *mal'āḵ* is effectively identical with Yahweh. To rebel against the *mal'āḵ* is tantamount to revolting against Yahweh: *kî šᵉmî bᵉqirbô.*

Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 42:8) extends Yahweh's declaration that he is working to deliver his people from the hand of their overlords. He gives his glory *(kāḇôḏ)* to no other. This *kāḇôḏ* is used as a divine epithet. It is preceded by two verbless clauses: *'ᵃnî yhwh* and *hû' šᵉmî.* In this case *šēm* and *yhwh* are identified (v. 8; cf. Jer. 16:21).

(8) A name can state a fact or become an epithet. A verbless construction emphasizes the fact, e.g., the presence of God's name in the temple (2 Ch. 20:9, *šimḵā babbayiṯ hazzeh*). The presence of *zēḵer* and *šēm* demonstrate lasting endurance: *yhwh šimḵā lᵉ'ôlām* par. *yhwh ziḵrᵉḵā lᵉḏōr-wāḏōr* (Ps. 135:13; cf. Ex. 3:15). The latter texts appear to make a clear distinction between Yahweh and *zēḵer/šēm.* The statement *yhwh 'ᵃḏōnênû* has its counterpart in *mâ-'addîr šimᵉḵā* (Ps. 8:2,10[1,9]). The majesty ascribed to the *šēm* is the majesty proper to Yahweh. The situation is similar when God's *šēm* is *'ᵉlōhîm* (48:11[10]). "Your name is near" (*qārôḇ šᵉmeḵā,* 75:2[1]) points to Yahweh's presence. The meaning of the statement *yhwh šᵉmô* (Ex. 15:3) does not derive from the clause itself but from the context. It parallels *yhwh 'îš milḥāmâ,* and the context shows that it is Yahweh who delivers Israel at the sea (cf. Jer. 33:2; Am. 5:8; 9:6).

Extended constructions raise the question whether the form was not chosen in order to inculcate the substance of the extension: *yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ šᵉmô* (Isa. 48:2; 51:15; 54:5; Jer. 10:16; 31:35; 32:18; 46:18; 48:15; 50:34; 51:19,57), *yhwh 'ᵉlōhê-ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ šᵉmô* (Am. 4:13), *'ᵉlōhê-ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ šᵉmô* (Am. 5:27). The same is true when an attribute of Yahweh is identified as his name: *šᵉmô qᵉḏôš yiśrā'ēl* (Isa. 47:4) says that *qᵉḏôš yiśrā'ēl* is the substance conveyed by the *šēm* (cf. *qāḏôš šᵉmô,* Isa. 57:15; *qāḏôš wᵉnôrā' šᵉmô,* Ps. 111:9). The parallel verbless clauses *'attâ yhwh 'āḇînû* and *gō'ᵃlēnû mē'ôlām šᵉmeḵā* show that *šēm* makes a qualitative statement about its bearer: he is Redeemer. The literary equiv-

alency of *'attâ yhwh* and *š^{e}mekā* allows us to assume that *šēm* and *yhwh* are interchangeable (cf. Jer. 10:6).

2. *In Combination.* Within the broad semantic spectrum of *šēm,* the particular meaning appropriate to a given context is determined by the verb and its valents. The result of analysis is highly varied and complex, since more than eighty verbs have *šēm* as a direct object or appear in a clause with *šēm* in a prepositional phrase.

a. *Verbs of Speaking.* Among verbs of speaking, we note the following:

(1) The only passage where *šēm* is associated contextually with the niphal of *'mr* is Gen. 32:29. Jacob will no longer be called Jacob but *yiśrā'ēl;* by popular etymology the new name signifies that he contended *(śrh)* with *'elōhîm* and humans, and prevailed. This explanation of the name compounded with *'ēl* is not compelling.

(2) The verb *brk* (qal, piel, and pual) appears 17 times with *šēm* or *b^{e}šēm* in various contexts. When *brk* is in the passive, *šēm* is the subject. In only one text is a subject *(kol-bāśār)* named in an active clause. The direct object is usually *'ām* or *'eṯ* + suffix. In clauses without a direct object, the action itself is the goal; this is true particularly when we have a series of cultic actions ending with *brk,* e.g., *'md — šrt — brk b^{e}šēm.* In the Psalms a number of parallelisms make the relationship more precise: *ûḇārûḵ šēm k^{e}ḇôḏô* par. *w^{e}yimmālē' k^{e}ḇôḏô* (Ps. 72:19), *šîrû l^{e}yhwh* par. *bār^{a}ḵû š^{e}mô* (96:2), *hôḏû-lô* par. *bār^{a}ḵû š^{e}mô* (100:4), *bār^{a}ḵî 'eṯ-yhwh* par. *'eṯ-šēm qoḏšô* (103:1), *'^{a}rômimkā* par. *wa'^{a}ḇār^{a}ḵâ šimḵā* (145:1), *t^{e}hillaṯ yhwh y^{e}ḏabber-pî* par. *wîḇārēḵ . . . šēm qoḏšô* (145:21).

Dt. 10:8-9 appears somewhat isolated. The passage lists the tasks of the Levites: to carry the ark of Yahweh, to stand before him, to minister to him, and *l^{e}ḇārēḵ biš^{e}mô.* One of the Levites' functions is thus described as *l^{e}ḇārēḵ,* defined by *b^{e}šēm.* The expression *b^{e}šēm* is also a qualifier, so that *b^e* is to be understood instrumentally: the blessing is bestowed with the help of the name (= of Yahweh; the name is the vehicle of divine power) (cf. Dt. 21:5, where the priests [cf. 1 Ch. 23:13] take over this function [*šēm* here with *yhwh* as *nomen rectum*]).

In an earlier period "blessing" was not restricted to the Levites and priests, as 2 S. 6:18 shows (cf. 1 Ch. 16:2). While there is some truth to the observation that David brought the ark to Jerusalem on his own initiative and without a direct command from Yahweh, when he offers sacrifice he is brought within the domain of the cult and its structures, so that the meaning of *b^{e}šēm yhwh ṣ^{e}ḇā'ôṯ* here does not differ fundamentally from its meaning in the texts cited previously. Since David is the grammatical subject, Brongers's statement that "the name of Yahweh is the subject" is misleading.[12] Should he mean that the energy conveyed by the blessing resides in the power of *b^{e}šēm yhwh ṣ^{e}ḇā'ôṯ,* not in the words of a king, we may agree. These last two passages also show that when the direct object *('eṯ-hā'ām)* is mentioned explicitly the relations between *brk* piel and *b^{e}šēm* remain the same (cf. Ps. 118:26 and the addendum in 129:8).

When the verb is passive *(bārûḵ)* and the subject is Yahweh (Ps. 72:18) or *šēm*

12. Brongers, "Wendung," 8.

(v. 19a), *brk* cannot mean "bless." The parallel with *yimmālē'* [read *yimlā'*] *k^{e}ḇôḏô 'eṯ-kol hā'āreṣ* in v. 19b shows that the text refers to celebration or praise. This is true in the concluding verse (v. 19a), where *kāḇôḏ* appears as *nomen rectum* with *šēm* (an alternate term for Yahweh[13]). The connection between *šēm* and Yahweh is even clearer in 113:2, which follows the thrice-repeated *hall^{e}lû* of v. 1. The pass. ptcp. *m^{e}ḇōrāḵ* ("praised") is introduced by the hortative *y^{e}hî* ("be"); the subject is *šēm yhwh*, which (as in v. 1c) represents an expanded form of "Yahweh" (cf. Job 1:21; Dnl. 2:20 [*'^{e}lāhā'*]).

In Ps. 96:1-2 *bār^{a}ḵû š^{e}mô* (v. 2b) follows the thrice-repeated *šîrû l^{e}yhwh*. The name of Yahweh is to be praised. The name is more than a designation, and also more than the power and might of its bearer suggested or realized in the name. Thematically, the substance of the text would be reduced by a degree if the name were not interchangeable with Yahweh. That this is not the case is shown by the following clause, which refers to God's saving act, thus continuing to speak of Yahweh. The same use of *šēm* is found in Ps. 100:4 and 145:1. Ps. 103:1 and 145:21 go on to preclude any confusion with phenomena of the natural world by qualifying *šēm* with the *nomen rectum qoḏšô* (in both cases in parallel with Yahweh), a quality sui generis that is proper only to God.

(3) One text (Ps. 89:17[16]) constructs *gyl* (qal) with *b^{e}šēm;* the suffix of *šēm* refers to Yahweh. The clauses *b^{e}šim^{e}ḵā y^{e}ḡîlûn* and *b^{e}ṣiḏqāṯ^{e}ḵā yārûmû* stand in synonymous parallelism. V. 17(16) extols those whose God is *the* king. They walk in God's intimate presence ("in the light of your countenance"), a presence that other texts say mortals cannot endure (v. 16[15]). When vv. 17(16) and 18(17) are viewed together, we see that *b^{e}šim^{e}ḵā* describes an experience of God that parallels *b^{e}ṣiḏqāṯ^{e}ḵā* ("through strength and favor"). Those who belong to God's people *y^{e}ḡîlûn* ("exult") because of *(b^{e})* the name, i.e., Yahweh himself, who bears the name and is substantially present in it. They extol *(yārûmû)* the result, God's salvific work.

(4) The piel of *dbr* occurs 14 times with *b^{e}šēm*. In 7 cases the verb has a direct object. The prepositional phrase *b^{e}šēm* plays a different syntactic and semantic role here, denoting the motivating entity, either named (usually Yahweh) or indicated by a suffix (6 times, all referring to Yahweh). The phrase occurs primarily in Dtn/Dtr texts. In Dt. 18:20 Yahweh warns a prophet not to speak in the name of other gods. Since no individual names are mentioned and there is no direct object, it is clear that *b^{e}šēm* with the piel of *dbr* means "on behalf of." According to Dnl. 9:6 and 1 Ch. 21:19, no one must speak a word in "my" (Yahweh's) name unless empowered to do so. According to Dt. 18:19, a person who does not heed what a prophet says in the name of Yahweh will be held accountable. But if a prophet presumes to speak in the name of Yahweh, the failure of the thing to take place is evidence that Yahweh did not speak to him or commission him (v. 22; cf. Jer. 29:23; Zec. 13:3).

Since Jeremiah's preaching has brought him only scorn and derision, he wants to stop speaking in Yahweh's name (Jer. 20:9), i.e., to stop preaching as Yahweh's prophet. It is implied that God's speech is uttered only through the prophet (cf. Jer. 44:16).

---

13. In support of this identification see Grether, 35.

King Ahab and the prophet Micaiah live in perpetual conflict. At Jehoshaphat's instigation Ahab asks the prophet for an oracle of Yahweh. Knowing full well that the prophet does not expect to be taken seriously, he adjures him to speak nothing but the truth *bᵉšēm yhwh* (1 K. 22:16; 2 Ch. 18:15). Here we have the simple observation that the prophet speaks in the name of Yahweh (and not of any other god; cf. Jer. 26:16; 2 Ch. 33:18).

(5) There are 12 occurrences of *hll* (piel, pual, and hithpael) with the dir. obj. *šēm* or with *'eṯ šēm, lᵉšēm,* or *bᵉšēm.* These occurrences include two hortative forms and three imperatives. The noun *šēm* may be qualified by a theonym *(yhwh, 'ᵉlōhîm), qoḏšô,* or *tip'arteḵā.* Once a subject is indicated (*'eḇyôn,* Ps. 74:21). The expression appears in hymnic passages, and the texts have religious content. There are several parallelisms: *hll* (piel) *šēm* par. *gdl* (piel) *bᵉṯôḏâ* (69:31[30]), *hallᵉlû yâ* par. *hallᵉlû 'eṯ-šēm yhwh* (133:1), *hôḏû lᵉyhwh* par. *qir'û bišᵉmô* (105:1), *hallᵉlû yâ* par. *hallᵉlû 'eṯ-šēm yhwh* (135:1), *'ᵃḇārᵃḵeḵā* par. *'ᵃhallᵉlâ šimᵉḵā* (145:2), *yᵉhallᵉlû šᵉmô* par. *yᵉzammᵉrû-lô* (149:3).

After catastrophe (Joel 2:25), Yahweh will see to it that food is available in abundance; then the name of Yahweh will be praised (v. 26). The verse goes on to add that Yahweh has wondrously delivered his people. If the antecedent of *'ᵃšer* is not the *nomen rectum* or the noun in apposition but *šēm,* the *nomen regens,* the direct object of *hll,* then the verse ascribes this wondrous act to *šēm,* and *šēm yhwh* serves as a fuller form of the divine name. In Ps. 69:31(30), again, the psalmist praises the *šēm-'ᵉlōhîm* in the midst of affliction, confident of Yahweh's help (cf. 74:21). In 148:13 the imperative to praise *šēm yhwh* is followed by the motivation: his *šēm* alone is exalted. Here a distinction is made between Yahweh and *šēm.* Even before mentioning Yahweh's mighty acts in history, 105:3 begins with a summons to glory in his holy name *(bᵉšēm qoḏšô).* The prepositional construction, which is closely related rhetorically to *mᵉḇaqᵉšê yhwh* (v. 4), shows that "in the name" means more than a superficial identification by name. At the least, the "name" is seen as the presence of the divine aura.

The ejaculations in 113:1 and 135:1 clearly go a step further. The same construction is used in each: two parallel clauses introduced with the impv. *hallᵉlû* have as their direct objects *yâ* and the parallel *'eṯ-šēm yhwh.* In these clauses Yahweh is identified with *šēm.* Ps. 113:3; 145:2; 149:3; 1 Ch. 16:10-11 are to be understood in the same sense. This interpretation is confirmed by Ps. 148:5 (the usage in v. 13 differs), with two arguments. In vv. 2-3 Yahweh is the sole direct object of *hallᵉlû.* In v. 5 the summons to praise is followed by the statement that he (antecedent: *šēm yhwh*) commanded and the elements of the cosmos were created (*br'* niphal). In 1 Ch. 29:13 *šēm* appears to stand in place of Yahweh. Riches and honor come from Yahweh, who combines in himself all power, might, and sovereignty and bestows them on mortals. Therefore praise and thanks are due to *'ᵉlōhîm* and (in parallel) *šēm,* which is associated with *tip'ereṯ* as *nomen rectum,* also used as an epithet of God.

(6) The verb *zkr* (qal, niphal, and hiphil) is associated directly with *šēm* or *bᵉšēm* 8 times. As *nomen rectum* with *šēm* we find the theonyms *yhwh* and *'ᵉlōhîm,* as well as various suffixes. We find *zkr šēm* and *šmr tôrâ* used in parallel in Ps. 119:55, which speaks of the name of Yahweh in the narrower sense. The psalmist recalls Yahweh's

name even at night (i.e., always) and is induced to keep (*šmr;* cf. 20:8) Yahweh's instruction *(tôrâ).*

In Ex. 20:23-24 the prohibition against making gods of silver or gold is followed by Yahweh's command to build a technologically primitive altar of earth and sacrifice the burnt offerings and offerings of well-being on it. In this setting (v. 24), Yahweh promises to come only to the place where he causes his name to be remembered *(zkr* [hiphil] *'eṯ-šᵉmî)* and to bless it. The name is a reality that can bring about God's presence; it sets a place apart in such a way that the name itself (in the fullest sense) is effectually present as God.

In the polemic against Canaanite religion, Yahweh successfully eliminates the names of the Baals. As a result, no one remembers their names (Hos. 2:19[17]). In the context of foreign gods, too, *šēm* represents more than just a formal identifying or distinguishing element; in fact, no personal name is mentioned. A "name" is linked with the reality that someone or something — here foreign gods — influences the thought and way of life of a human being (cf. Am. 6:10: *bᵉšēm yhwh* as dir. obj.; Jer. 11:9: *šᵉmô*). Therefore the name does not even have to be spoken (Ex. 23:13). That the line between a pronounceable name and a real (divine) actuality is fluid is shown by Josh. 23:7: the prohibition against thinking of the gods *(bᵉšēm 'ᵉlōhîm)* is followed by a prohibition against swearing by them (possibly referring to their names). Of course one does not "serve" *('bd)* the name and bow down *(hištaḥᵃwâ)* before it; these verbs clearly refer to the gods.

(7) In 10 passages *šēm* (with or without *lᵉ;* the meaning is the same) is the direct object of *zmr* II (piel). The frequency of the 1st person singular (5 times) is striking. Qualifying *šēm* we find *yhwh 'elyôn, 'elyôn,* and various suffixes. The referent is always Yahweh. All the texts exhibit a hortative intention. This combination of words is typical of the language of the Psalms; it does not occur outside the Psalter. There are, nevertheless, a great many parallel formulations with *ydh, 'ls, šlm,* etc.

The psalmist, delivered from the threat of enemies, feels obligated to sing *lᵉšimḵā* (Ps. 18:50[49]; 2 S. 22:50; cf. Ps. 9:3[2]; 66:2). Unlike the wicked, the psalmist will give thanks to Yahweh and sing praises to the name of Yahweh, the Most High (7:18). The certainty that Yahweh will hear his prayer causes the psalmist to rejoice (61:9[8]; cf. 92:[1]) and affirm that he will pay his vows. Since God looks with favor on the poor and is a father to the orphan and an advocate for the widow, the congregation should praise God's name. In 135:3 simply the inner urge to praise finds expression in *hll* piel and *zmr* piel together. Since Yahweh is the direct object of one verb and *šēm* is the direct object of the other, the two words are identified; *šēm* means Yahweh himself. Taking a universal perspective, 66:4 sees the whole earth prostrate in worship of God and praising the *šēm,* i.e., Yahweh. In all the texts that use the piel of *zmr* with *šēm, šēm* appears in parallel with Yahweh, so that it represents an alternative form of the name Yahweh itself.

(8) Fourteen texts use *šēm* as the direct object (some unmarked, some with *'eṯ, lᵉ*) of *ydh* hiphil. As a *nomen rectum* with *šēm,* we find *yhwh* and *qoḏšeḵā.* Other qualifiers are the adjective phrase *gāḏôl wᵉnôrā'* and the 2d person singular suffix (10 times). Apart from the Dtr texts and the Chronicler's texts dependent on them, together with

Ps. 99:3 and 122:4 (Zion theology), all the occurrences are set in the language of prayer. One clause includes a grammatical subject (*ṣaddîqîm*, Ps. 140:14[13]). As parallels we find such verbs as *rwm, hll,* and *šḥh.*

In 1 K. 8:33 (cf. 2 Ch. 6:24), in the prayer ascribed to Solomon, the arguments accord with Dtr ideology. The people have been defeated by the enemy because they have sinned against Yahweh. Then they return, praise the name of Yahweh, and pray to him; their prayer is heard. In 1 K. 8:35 (2 Ch. 6:26), too, the praise of Yahweh's name is a token of the people's confession of Yahweh when they turn from their sin, whereupon Yahweh sends rain. Unlike the rest of the occurrences, these two texts are in prose and cite no parallel arguments.

Ps. 99:3 bears the stamp of Zion theology. Because Yahweh is exalted over all the people, they are to praise his name. Ps. 122:4 reflects the same theme: the tribes go up to the mighty city of Jerusalem to praise the name of Yahweh.

Yahweh's care for the poor and support for their cause is the prelude to praise. Ps. 140:14(13) treats "they praise your name" and "they live before your face" as equivalent. Since other texts imply that to see the face of God is to risk one's life (see Gen. 32:31[30] and Ex. 33:23 — both passages in which *šēm* also appears in the immediate context), both name and face must be seen as very intensive forms of God's presence. In Ps. 142:8(7) the poor psalmist's cry for help and deliverance from his persecutors, who are too strong for him, leads to an infinitival purpose clause: the goal is to praise "your name." This statement fits with the theme of 140:14(13). In Isa. 25:1ff., the highly personal words of the supplicant are intended to constrain God to heed the destruction of the city at the beginning of the exile (v. 2) and the speaker's plea for help, by appealing to the fulfillment of Yahweh's own plans. At the outset, the supplicant states emphatically: "Yahweh, you are my God." This affirmation is illustrated by the fact that he does not lament but is engaged (imperfect) in exalting (*rûm* polel) Yahweh and praising (*ydh* hiphil) his name. In Ps. 54:8(6) "exalt," "praise your name," and "perform a vow" appear together.

God has saved the worshipers from their foes (Ps. 44:8[7]). They therefore boast continually of their (saving) God and praise "his name," which in this context stands in synonymous parallelism with *'ᵉlōhîm* (v. 9[8]). Ps. 106:47 pleads (also collectively) to be saved and gathered from among the nations. The infinitives that follow *(lᵉhôḏôṯ* and *lᵉhištabbēaḥ)* are to be understood as expressing purpose. The purpose of Yahweh's salvation is that his holy name be praised and his glory celebrated. Name *(šēm)* and glory *(tᵉhillâ)* are things that affect Yahweh directly (cf. 1 Ch. 16:35). Before saying that God has special regard for the lowly (Ps. 138:6), the psalmist, prostrating himself in the direction of the holy temple (the place where the Holy One is present), sings the praises of the name. "I praise your name for your steadfast love *(ḥeseḏ)* and your faithfulness *('ᵉmeṯ)*" is equivalent to "I praise you . . ."; *šēm* is a fuller way of referring to God. Almost all the *ydh* texts are responses to affliction, threat, or discrimination against the poor. This setting distinguishes *ydh* from the connotations of (e.g.) *hll.*

(9) The impv. *hāḇû,* presumably from the root **yhb,* occurs twice. In each case the direct object is a construct phrase with *šēm* as the *nomen rectum.* The indirect object is *lᵉyhwh.* Elements of the much-debated initial verse of Ps. 29 derive from the religious

language and thought of Canaan (e.g., "children of the gods"; in the cycle *kāḇôḏ* is given by El to the gods, who in turn give it back to El). As the text has been integrated into Yahwism, it now sees in *kāḇôḏ* and *h^a^ḏārâ* tokens of Yahweh's majesty. As *nomen rectum* to each parallel *nomen regens* we find *šēm* and *qōḏeš.* Quite apart from the origin of the psalm, it is reasonable to understand both *šēm* and *qōḏeš* as being linked to the divine realm. The former denotes the ever-present divine aura, the latter, the inbreaking aura.

In 1 Ch. 16:29-30 the speaker (David) borrows Ps. 29 almost word for word, but alters it characteristically: the "children of the gods" become the "families of the people," who bring offerings to Yahweh, thus defining the concrete way in which *hāḇû k^e^ḇôḏ š^e^mô* takes place. Since offerings are brought only to Yahweh, it is probably an understatement to say that these words are an expansion drawing on cultic language: the author understood giving *k^e^ḇôḏ š^e^mô* as the worship of Yahweh *(l^e^yhwh)* himself.

(10) The verb *knh* piel, "give an honorific name," governs *šēm* in two texts, in the form of the prepositional phrase *b^e^šēm.* In Isa. 45:1ff., although Yahweh is speaking, the theme is secular. The verb *qr'* appears in parallel. Yahweh describes what he is doing for Cyrus for the sake of Israel: he calls him and gives him an honorific name (*'^a^ḵann^e^ḵā bišmeḵā,* v. 4); the actual name is not specified.

In Isa. 44:1ff. Yahweh promises salvation to his people; as one element, he will pour out his spirit and his blessing (v. 3). Some of the consequences are associated specifically with Yahweh, others with the people (albeit as those Yahweh has saved). Among the latter, we find *y^e^ḵanneh b^e^šēm yiśrā'ēl* (v. 5). The context is extremely artful, exhibiting an interesting kind of chiastic structure. To the statement of one *(zeh), l^e^yhwh '^a^nî* (a), there corresponds the lettering on the hand of the other: *l^e^yhwh* (a′). To the clause *yiqrā' b^e^šēm-ya'^a^qōḇ* (b) there corresponds *b^e^šēm yiśrā'ēl y^e^ḵanneh* (b′). Since the clauses b and b′ are formulated in the active voice, the verbs govern direct objects. For *knh* (piel) *b^e^šēm yiśrā'ēl,* this means that the speaker pronounces "the name Israel" as an honorific name, showing that he recognizes the new beginning God has made with Israel and — by inference from the chiastic words of belonging — that he is part of it.

(11) Four texts connect *n'ṣ* (qal, piel, hithpoal) syntactically with *šēm;* in three of these it is the direct object. Parallelism occurs in Jer. 14:21; Ps. 74:10,18. Jer. 14:19-22 is a communal lament, which ends in a statement of trust in Yahweh, creator and deliverer. Within the passage, the supplicants confess their transgressions. There follows (v. 21) an appeal to Yahweh for his name's sake not to spurn or dishonor the throne of his glory (paraphrastic for the place of his presence). By reason of its various connotations, the phrase *l^e^ma'an šim^e^ḵā* can be understood as "for your own sake."

The argumentation in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 52:3-6) is based on the notion that the Israelites' times as aliens in foreign lands should not be viewed (solely) as the consequence of sin (vv. 3-4). If one starts from the assumption that the historical fate of the people bears witness to their protection by their own God, then the violent exercise of power by the rulers is an assault on Yahweh himself. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that such conduct is an unremitting defamation of Yahweh's name (v. 5). Here *šēm* may mean the name "Yahweh" in contrast to the names of Babylonian gods, espe-

cially Marduk; but it is safe to assume that the name is connected organically with Yahweh, so that to revile the name is to revile Yahweh himself.

Ps. 74 is a communal lament, in which the worshipers say that they have been left without tokens or prophets for guidance. This statement is followed in v. 10 by a question: How long will the oppressor defame God *('ᵉlōhîm)* and the enemy revile God's name? The strict parallelism indicates that *'ᵉlōhîm* and *šēm* are interchangeable counterparts. In v. 18, in a similar context, *yhwh* and *šēm* correspond. Thus vv. 10 and 18 illustrate the intrinsic fusion of *'ᵉlōhîm, yhwh,* and *šēm.*

(12) There are 9 occurrences of *nb'* (niphal, hithpael) with *bᵉšēm,* all in Jeremiah. The noun is determined by *yhwh* as *nomen rectum* as well as by the 1st person singular suffix (always with Yahweh as antecedent). This association shows that the usage is always theological. In Jer. 11:21 Yahweh quotes the rebuke leveled at Jeremiah by the people of Anathoth, persecuting him so that his life is in danger: "Stop speaking as a prophet in the name of Yahweh *(bᵉšēm yhwh).*" Since the prophet does not speak on his own initiative but transmits the words of Yahweh, who sends him, *bᵉšēm* encompasses both the actual name of the God who commissions him and "at Yahweh's behest, on Yahweh's authority" (cf. v. 9; also 26:20).

The most severe charge against the prophets who prophesy salvation and well-being instead of the imminent catastrophe is that they "are prophesying lies in my name" (Jer. 14:14; 23:25). What this means is that they are only pretending to have received a message from Yahweh. This is stated expressly in 27:15, in the same thematic context: "I truly *(kî)* have not sent them" — therefore their prophecy is a lie (*šeqer,* 29:9). The consequence of unauthorized appropriation of Yahweh's name (14:14-15) is that the very prophets who deny the imminent threat of sword and famine will perish by them (cf. 29:21).

(13) Each of the two occurrences of *ngd* hiphil with *šēm* as its direct object is in the context of an "angelic encounter." In Gen. 32:28-31 the question of the *šēm* goes back and forth in various formulations. While wrestling, the man (*'îš,* v. 25) and Jacob ask each other's name. Here are we not interested in the etiologies but in the different ways the request is formulated. Using the niphal of *'mr,* Jacob's opponent declares that Jacob shall no longer be called "Jacob" but "Israel." With an emphatic imperative, Jacob asks directly: "Just tell me *(haggîḏâ-nnā')* your name" (v. 30). Since this request follows upon a change of Jacob's name and thus an interpretation of his competence, *šēm* should be seen as more than a linguistic act of differentiation and individuation or an instrument facilitating community.[14] The still unknown figure, by telling his name, would have told who he really is. Thus *šēm* becomes a vehicle of information about its bearer.

If one wishes to withhold information about one's name, it is possible to evade the question by asking a counterquestion. An *'îš hā'ᵉlōhîm* with the appearance of a *mal'aḵ hā'ᵉlōhîm* appears to the mother of Samson to foretell his birth (Jgs. 13:3-24). The fear aroused by the figure's aura probably prevented the woman from asking any questions.

---

14. Van der Woude, 1351.

It would seem only natural to ask a stranger where he has come from; nevertheless, the *'îš hā'ᵉlōhîm* does not tell his name (*lō'-higgîḏ,* v. 6). Since the figure's outward appearance makes quite clear that he is not an ordinary human being, revelation of his name would have the same effect as in Gen. 32:30.

(14) The verb *nqb* (qal, niphal) governs *šēm* in 10 passages (4 times unmarked, 6 times with *bᵉ*). The predominance of the pl. *šēmôṯ* (6 times) is striking. The usage may be either secular or religious. In one case *yhwh* appears as *nomen rectum.*

When Jerusalem is rebuilt at God's initiative after the exile, its vindication and salvation will shine forth and the nations will see the people's vindication. The city will be called by a new name *(šēm ḥāḏāš),* given by the mouth of Yahweh (Isa. 62:2).

In 1 Ch. 16:39, in the context of organizing the duties of the priests, David assigns Zadok to minister before the tabernacle of Yahweh to ensure that the sacrifices are offered correctly. Those assigned to him are mentioned in v. 41, two by their own personal names, the other *bᵉšēmôṯ.* The reader still senses the meaning "pierce, designate" in *nqb,* because the naming also entails an obligation. The *šēmôṯ* — individual names are not listed — stand for the persons so named, since names cannot be assigned a ministry. Thus *šēm* plays two roles: it both characterizes the persons in question and marks them as individuals. Here *bᵉšēmôṯ* concretizes "by name" and means "each person" (the same broad meaning is present in Nu. 1:17; Ezr. 8:20; 1 Ch. 12:32[31]; 2 Ch. 28:15; 31:19).

In Lev. 24:11,16, we find an extremely negative variant meaning for *nqb.* Anyone — alien or citizen — who utters *(nôqēḇ) 'eṯ haššēm* or *bᵉšēm yhwh* is to be stoned; here the verb can only be taken as meaning "contemn, mock" (NRSV "blaspheme").

(15) The vb. *spr* (piel) governs *šēm* 3 times (in parallel with *hll* in Ps. 22:23[22]; 102:22[21]). The noun is associated with Yahweh both by the use of *yhwh* as *nomen rectum* and by the 1st or 2d person singular suffix. This association makes clear that the theme is always religious.

Ex. 9:14-16, usually ascribed to a later redactor, explains why the destruction of the Egyptians is repeatedly deferred. Time is needed to show the power of Yahweh to all the earth, that people may tell of (*spr* piel, v. 16) his name. Here *šēm* denotes the fame achieved by vastly superior power.

The second section of Ps. 22 begins with a hymnic summons. The psalmist wishes to tell of (*spr* piel, v. 23[22]) Yahweh's name in a liturgical environment *(qāhāl),* in the midst of his kindred. The par. *'ᵃhallᵉleḵā* shows that we are dealing with a situation that calls for praise and glory (cf. v. 24[23]). Since *šēm* is used as a theonym, we see that it denotes the glory (name as vehicle) that causes the psalmist to break forth in praise — redactionally after being rescued from affliction.

Ps. 102:21(20), too, refers — if only formulaically — to affliction, imprisonment, and death, from which Yahweh sets free. The purpose of this deliverance (final infinitive, v. 22[21]) is that the glory of Yahweh *(šēm yhwh)* may be declared in Zion. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallel "and his praise *(ûṯᵉhillāṯô)* in Jerusalem."

(16) The vb. *'lz* is used with *šēm* only in Ps. 68:5(4). The syntax of this verse is difficult. Since "raise up him who rides on the clouds" (v. 5c[4c]) represents a complete clause, which does not connect with *bᵉyâ šᵉmô,* the latter words must introduce clause d

in this verse. The object of the impv. *'il^{e}zû* is *b^{e}yâ,* expanded interpretively by *š^{e}mô.* The locative *l^{e}pānāyw* points to a cultic setting. But *w^e* is prefixed to *'il^{e}zû,* which appears abruptly in the midst of the clause. Müller has shown that such a *w^e* is prefixed for emphasis.[15] The context is religious.

Vv. 4-5(3-4) employ a wealth of forms denoting the "praise" (cf. the verbs: *śmḥ, śyś, zmr, šyr, sll*) that the *ṣaddîqîm* are to render. Already the two stichs that begin v. 5(4) identify *'^{e}lōhîm* and *šēm.*[16] The first stich of the second pair incorporates a Canaanite element: "he who rides on the clouds." The parallel appropriates this expression for Yahwism: praise is to be given to *yâ,* the abbreviated form of the theonym *yhwh.* To avoid any misunderstanding, the verse adds that this is his real *šēm.*

(17) In one passage (2 K. 2:23-24) *qll* (piel) governs *šēm.* A short distance from Bethel some boys jeer at Elisha, calling him "Baldhead," whereupon the prophet fixes his gaze on them and curses *(qll)* them in the name of Yahweh (*b^{e}šēm yhwh,* v. 24). The legendary and exaggerated story (two bears maul forty-two children) shows that pronouncing the name of Yahweh with malicious intent has destructive consequences. (Brongers finds a second occurrence in 1 S. 17:43, but his argument cannot be sustained.[17] On the one hand, it proves too much: wherever a name does not appear, one can be supplied. On the other hand, even if his assumption is granted, there is no hint of any occurrence of *šēm.*)

(18) The vb. *rnn* (piel) occurs once with *šēm,* in Ps. 89:13(12): *'attâ b^{e}rā'ṯām* par. *b^{e}šim^{e}ḵā y^{e}rannēnû.* In a context devoted to the theme of creation, vv. 12-13(11-12) list several outstanding works. Speaking on a cosmic level, vv. 12b(11b) and 13a(12a) use creation terminology; in v. 13b(12b) the mountains rejoice *b^{e}šim^{e}ḵā.* In *šēm* is made known the one who mightily created the cosmos.

(19) Three texts use *šā'al* in conjunction with *šēm.* In 1 S. 25:5 David sends ten of his young men to Nabal. Among other things they are to ask after his well-being, and to do so *bišmî,* i.e., "on my [David's] behalf."

Identical clauses appear in Gen. 32:30(29) and Jgs. 13:18. In each a human (Jacob, Manoah) asks a figure from the divine sphere (in Jgs. 13:17 *mal'aḵ yhwh*) for his *šēm,* and the figure refuses the information by asking a counterquestion. Analysis of the syntactic structure of the clause suggests that the object of *š'l,* introduced by *l^e,* should be considered a direct object: what is asked is the name. The refusal to answer indicates that this name would convey vital information about its bearer.

(20) The function of the prepositional phrase *b^{e}šēm* with the niphal of *šb'* (9 times; par. to *ḥll* in Lev. 19:12 and to *zkr* in Isa. 48:11) can be determined from the single instance of an antithesis. In Jer. 12:15 the return from exile is foretold. The text presumes that the Israelites are following the proper way of life, which can be recognized because they swear correctly — i.e., they implicate God as the ultimate guarantor of the trustworthiness of their assurances and promises, so that God is the final court of ap-

15. H. P. Müller, unpublished SBL paper, 1993.

16. See III.2.a.(7) above for *zmr.*

17. "Wendung," 9.

peal binding the one who swears ("Yahweh be between me and you," 1 S. 20:42). Concretely, this means swearing *bᵉšēm yhwh* and not *babbaʿal* (Jer. 12:16). Here *šēm* is an orally uttered name, in which the particular deity worshiped by the speaker becomes truly effectual.

The occurrence of *nišbaʿ bayhwh* in Jgs. 21:7 shows clearly that *yhwh* and *šēm* are truly interchangeable. Of course *bᵉšēm* is more common in this sense than is the mention of a specific theonym (cf. Dt. 6:13; 10:20; Isa. 48:1 [*bᵉšēm yhwh*]). It is therefore an especially serious transgression to swear in the name of Yahweh with intent to deceive (Zec. 5:4), since to do so is to profane the name of God (Lev. 19:12).

When Yahweh wishes to bind himself absolutely, in contrast to other gods, he can do so by means of an oath; but since only he can function as the reference point of the oath, its wording is: "I swear by my great name" (Jer. 44:26).

b. *qr'*. We treat the verb *qr'* separately because there are so many texts (86) that perspicuity requires subdivision. We shall first (1) discuss texts where *qr'* and *šēm* appear immediately together in either order. Then (2) we shall take up the texts where an additional element intervenes between *qr'* and *šēm*, and next (3) those where *šēm* is determined by the object marker *'eṯ*. Finally (4) we come to occurrences of *qr' bᵉšēm* or *bᵉšēm qr'*.

(1) The simple act of naming expressed by *qr' šēm* appears only in one verse, Ruth 4:17 (bis). Here the naming of Ruth's child is a social event in which women of the neighborhood participate, a circumstance that shows that the expression represents elevated usage.

Levirate marriage may involve a change of name. When a man who is bound to take his deceased brother's widow in marriage (Dt. 25:5-10) refuses to do so, the widow disgraces him publicly by pulling a sandal off his foot and spitting in his face (vv. 8-9). The people vilify him, calling him "Barefoot" (v. 10). The change of name (or the new nickname) conveys both the reason for it and its disgraceful context.

No reason is given in Gen. 35:10 for the change of Jacob's name to Israel; the text simply states the contextual circumstances (a theophany, with promises made by *'ᵉlōhîm*). The fate of those who forsake Yahweh is contrasted in Isa. 65:13-15 with that of Yahweh's servants. The climax is that the latter are called by a different name *(yiqrā' šēm 'aḥēr),* which implies that they have been brought by God's action into a new form of existence. The setting of the statement that Daniel had received a revelation notes that he had been given the name Belteshazzar by his overlord (Dnl. 10:1).

A name means recognition: when Boaz redeems Ruth, the people and elders in the gate wish that he may accumulate wealth in Ephrathah, so that his name may be called out in Bethlehem (Ruth 4:11), which can only mean that he enjoys recognition and respect. Because Yahweh has provided a *gō'ēl* for Naomi and Ruth in the person of Boaz, his name is to be renowned in Israel.

A name may be pronounced as a token of possession: in the battle to take Rabbah, Joab succeeds in capturing a vital part of the city, whereupon he calls for David to join the battle with reinforcements in order to take the city. In this context the expression *wᵉniqrā' šᵉmî ʿāleyhā* (2 S. 12:28) means possession of and sovereignty over the city.

In Isa. 4:1 being called by a name stands for integration into the postexilic legal sys-

tem. The stress of the postexilic period and the lack of men cause seven women to take hold of one man. They promise to provide their own sustenance if only they may have offspring and be tied into the legal system with the help of the man's name.

In etiological contexts the combination *qr' šēm* lays the groundwork on which the explanation is built. The formulaic expression gives the impression that it is meant to constitute a declaratory act. The subject affected by *qr' šēm* may be personal or inanimate (a town, a city, a cultic site, a well).

The children of Lot's daughters (Gen. 19:37-38) are given names that encode the fact that they are born from a blood relationship: *mô'āḇ* ("from the father") and *bēn-'ammî* ("child of my relative"). These two names, which interpret pejoratively the premonarchic names of Israel's neighbors, do not necessarily imply an incestuous relationship, as the narrative relates.

By means of *('al-kēn)* an event, Gen. 25:30 finds a name that establishes the genealogical relationship between Esau and Edom: Jacob has prepared a pot of red-colored food; Esau, returning hungry and exhausted from hunting, asks Jacob to give him "some of that red stuff" *(min-hā'āḏôm)* to eat. According to 25:25, Esau was born hairy (*śē'ār;* cf. Seir, the homeland of the Edomites) and received his name from the color of his red hair.

Tamar, pregnant by her father-in-law, Judah, bears twins. The ancestor of David (mentioned also in Ruth 4:12,18) is given the name Perez ("breach") because, although he was the first to be born, his brother had already put his hand out of the womb, around which the midwife had bound a crimson thread. This thread is connected somehow with the name Zerah *(zeraḥ),* the meaning of which is disputed (Gen. 38:29-30).

In the genealogy of Judah, Jabez (also the name of a Calebite village in 1 Ch. 2:42,55) plays a surprisingly extensive part, although later he plays no role at all. His mother called him *ya'bēṣ* (verbal clause) because she brought him into the world in pain *('ōṣēḇ)* (1 Ch. 4:9).

"Moses" is a hypocoristic form (found also in Egypt) of a generally longer name (cf. Thutmose, Ramses) using the Egyptian root *mśy,* "beget, bear." Ex. 2:10 undertakes to derive the name from the Heb. vb. *mšh,* "draw out," since Pharaoh's daughter says that she drew the child out of the water. The problems raised by this etymology are exemplified by the fact that *mōšeh* is an active participle, a form that rules out any direct reference to the action or to the person.

In Gen. 4:17 Cain founds an otherwise insignificant city and names it after his son Enoch. In Ex. 15:23, too, the existing toponym Marah is interpreted to signify that the arriving Israelites could not drink the bitter *(mar)* water there. Gen. 26 derives the names of two wells, Esek (v. 20) and Sitnah (v. 21), from quarrels *('ēśeq, śṭn)* between the herders of Gerar and Isaac. A subsequent well is called Rehoboth (v. 22) because in the interim room had been made (*rḥb* hiphil) peacefully.

According to Gen. 11:9, Babylon *(bāḇel)* was so named because Yahweh confused *(bll)* the language of all the earth there. Ishmael's name *(yišmā''ēl)* is derived from Yahweh's giving heed *(šm')* to Hagar's affliction (Gen. 16:11). In Ex. 17:7 a redactor has identified the twin sites Massah and Meribah and associated them with a mountain near Horeb where water was discovered unexpectedly. More widely attested are the

traditions that speak of two different places (Dt. 33:8; Ps. 95:8). Massah alone is mentioned in Dt. 6:16 and 9:22. According to Nu. 20; Ezk. 47:19; 48:28, Meribah is located near Kadesh-barnea; Dt. 32:51 localizes it in the wilderness of Zin. In Nu. 20:13,24; 27:14; Dt. 32:51; Ps. 81:8(7); 106:32, conflicts between the people and Moses or Yahweh are associated with the site. The Common Semitic root *ryb* suggests a place connected at an early date with legal actions. The people complain about lack of water (Ex. 17:2-7) and turn against Moses; v. 7 ascribes the naming of the site to this circumstance.

Many etiologies prove to be arbitrary interpretations that do not really provide etymological explanations of the names. Because Yahweh refrains from destroying Sodom until Lot has arrived at another city, the refugee calls it Zoar *(ṣôʿar)* (Gen. 19:22). The explanation of the name on the basis of the Hebrew root *ṣʿr,* "be small," has nothing to do with the context. An etiological aside in 25:26 says that Esau's brother Jacob, who bears an ancient Semitic name (cf. Akk. *yaḫqub-ilu,* "God protects"), was gripping his twin brother's heel when he was born, thus connecting his name (a verbal clause) with the noun *ʿēqēḇ,* "heel." According to 27:36, the etiology of Jacob's name (*ʿqb,* "supplant") serves in the mouth of Esau as a negative description of Jacob's conduct.

The naming of Jacob's "sons" by their mothers in Gen. 29–30 is striking. Many of these names are given an etiological interpretation with religious content, reflecting the tension between the wives and the conduct of their husband. Reuben ("Look, a son!" 29:32) is linked with Yahweh's compassion and the anticipated love of Leah's husband. The name Simeon ("hear," v. 33) is interpreted as a reference to Yahweh's hearing of Leah's desire for another son. The name Levi (v. 34) is derived from *lwh* niphal, "be joined," expressing Leah's hope for an enduring bond with her husband. According to v. 35, Judah's name derives from *ydh* hiphil, "praise, thank": Leah thanks Yahweh for her four sons. The name Naphtali (30:8) is traced to *ptl* niphal and interprets the competition for sons between the sisters as wrestlings with God (*napṯûlê ʾelōhîm;* NRSV "mighty wrestlings"). In v. 18 Leah interprets her naming of Issachar as a sign of God's reward *(śāḵār)* for her willingness to give her maid to her husband for the procreation of sons. Rachel's naming of Dan ("he judged," v. 6) sees in Yahweh's favor an act making her the equal of her fecund sister.

The heap of stones marking the boundary between Laban and Jacob is named *galʿēḏ* ("heap is/as witness," Gen. 31:48); it is used in a covenant ceremony with cultic elements. After the bitter battle with Amalek, Moses builds an altar and calls its name *yhwh nissî,* "Yahweh my banner" (Ex. 17:15).[18] The redactor, however, connects the name etiologically not with the preceding battle but with a permanent state of hostility (from generation to generation), in which Yahweh is to provide victorious superiority.

Gen. 32:3(2) connects the toponym Mahanaim with Jacob's encounter with angels of God *(malʾaḵê ʾelōhîm).* The word *maḥaneh,* "camp," would lead one to expect instead a reference to some military action; the angels do not explain the dual form. Jacob's setting out for Succoth and then giving the place the name Succoth (33:17) shows that

18. → נֵס *nēs.*

the etiology is secondary. This conclusion is reinforced by the observation that the formal naming does not connect with Jacob's own dwelling but with the pens for his cattle. Rebekah's nurse, anonymous in 24:59, is referred to as Deborah in 35:8; her tomb, near Bethel, is named *'allôn bāḵûṯ,* "oak of tears," probably reflecting the inclusion of Canaanite elements.

The expansive renaming of Jacob in Gen. 35:10 (four clauses with *šēm,* two of these with *qr' šēm*) and the explanation of why Jacob "is called" (i.e., "is") Israel stand in the context of a theophany, a sovereign bestowal of a blessing, and a promise of offspring and possession of the land (vv. 9-13); this is very different from the struggle with the "man" in 32:25-31(24-30).

In Ezk. 20:29 a play on words intended to establish the banality of the Canaanite cult explains the term *bāmâ,* "(cultic) high place" (according to v. 28, a sacred grove): *mâ habbāmâ,* taken as *mâ ha-bā-mâ,* "What's the 'what's-it'?" No meaning can be attached to the word.[19]

According to Gen. 35:17-18, Rachel suffers complications in childbirth; shortly before she dies, she names her son *ben-'ônî,* "son of my pangs." This is followed immediately and without explanation by the less formal statement (without *šēm*) that his father named him Benjamin ("child of good fortune"). Two different traditions are in conflict here. That the *qr' šēm* line is primary is suggested by the avoidance of the designation *ben-'ônî* elsewhere for Benjamin; it cannot therefore be a secondary invention.

Gen. 50:11 traces the toponym *'āḇēl miṣrayim,* "mourning of Egypt," to a funeral lamentation for Jacob on the part of Joseph and his Egyptian retinue (but cf. also *'āḇēl,* "watercourse"). The Canaanites, the early inhabitants *(yôšēḇ hā'āreṣ)* of Goren-atad, gave it this name when they observed the mourning. Both elements suggest that the redactors are well aware that the material is pre-Israelite; the interpretation, however, is based on Hebrew usage.

After consulting an oracle (2 S. 5:19), David advances to Baal-perazim, where he defeats the Philistines (v. 20). The theophoric toponym, pre-Israelite or non-Israelite (Baal), is stripped of its Canaanite dress since *hā'ᵉlōhîm* brings the victory, like a flood bursting a dam *(kᵉpereṣ mayim).* Strangely, the text concludes from this *('al-kēn)* that the name with the element "Baal" derives from these words of David. One would expect a different theonym if the situation were historical.

Often a name has a kerygmatic aspect. When King Ahaz refuses to name a domain in which God may give a sign *('ôṯ),* Yahweh provides one on his own initiative (Isa. 7:11-12): the *'almâ* will bear a child and call his name *'immānû 'ēl,* "God with us." This name means not only that the child was promised by God but also that in him — in contrast to the reigning king — God will make a new beginning. Another royal offspring (9:5[6]) is accorded regnal names in the Egyptian style — such names are not attested for any king of Israel or Judah. In Egypt five regnal names were given as a standard element of the king's investiture from the Middle Kingdom onward.

The children of prophets bear names that become part of the message of their fa-

19. But see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 402.

thers. In Isa. 8:1-2 Isaiah is told to write the words *mahēr šālāl ḥāš baz* on a tablet; they will be his son's name: "swift the spoil, speedy the plunder" (v. 3) — foretelling the victory over Damascus and Samaria. Hosea's first son is given the name *yizr*[e]*e'l* (Hos. 1:4), which is identical with the name of the city where Jehu began the brutal extermination of his opponents. Now the name foretells the fall of the royal house. The name of Hosea's daughter *lō' ruḥāmâ,* "she is no longer loved" (Hos. 1:6), signals the withdrawal of God's love. Just as a woman gives life to her children from her womb *(reḥem),* loves them, and thus demonstrates her inalienable capacity, so the withdrawal of this love blocks this essential property of the woman. The name thus shows that God's actions strike at the very heart of the people. The perfect tense expresses absolute certainty. The child with the name *lō' 'ammî,* "not my people," embodies to the uttermost the separation between God and God's people.

The name is often an alternative way of referring to Yahweh. In a text describing the blessing that Yahweh will command upon Israel in all areas of its life (Dt. 28:8), we read that Yahweh will make the people prosper, on the condition that they keep the commandments and walk in God's ways (v. 9). Then all the peoples shall see that the *šēm yhwh* is proclaimed upon *('al)* Israel (v. 10). Thus we see that *šēm yhwh* denotes Yahweh himself.

Ps. 99:6 lists outstanding and exemplary worshipers of Yahweh: Moses, Aaron, and Samuel. The last is described as being among the *qôr'ê š*[e]*mô,* which means that he "cried Yahweh" (dir. obj.). This interpretation is confirmed by the following words: "They cried to Yahweh and he answered them."

In deadly peril the supplicant sees his end approaching. From the pit his voice is heard: *qārā'ṯî šim*[e]*ḵā yhwh* (Lam. 3:55). Here *yhwh* can be construed as a vocative or as an appositive stating the theonym. In either case *šēm,* though not identical with Yahweh, is a path of direct access to God, through which the supplicant hopes to be heard (v. 56). In 1 Ch. 13:5 all Israel sets out to bring the ark from Kiriath-jearim. This ark is described as the ark of Elohim, who is identified with Yahweh, who is enthroned on the cherubim. Yahweh is concretely present with the ark, *'*[a]*šer-niqrā' šēm.* The theonym no longer needs to be stated (but cf. the same scene in 2 S. 6:2), since it is interchangeable with *šēm.*

In the Song of Moses, Moses' teaching drops like life-giving dew on grass and greenery, since *(kî)* he proclaims the *šēm yhwh* (Dt. 32:3). This act may be construed as praise, since the parallel stich says: "Praise the greatness of our God *('*[e]*lōhênû).*" Because *šēm yhwh* is equated with *'*[e]*lōhîm,* it may be viewed as a fuller formulation of the name of Yahweh: *šēm* merges into the *nomen rectum.*

The statement *niqrā' š*[e]*mî 'al . . .* expresses a special closeness between God and the object in question, a relationship that can entail legal levels. In Jer. 15:15-16 Jeremiah, attacked by his enemies, throws himself into Yahweh's arms, pleading for help. He reaffirms that Yahweh's words were the delight of his heart — because "I am called by your name" *(niqrā' šim*[e]*ḵā 'ālay).* The vocative *yhwh '*[e]*lōhê ṣ*[e]*ḇā'ôṯ* (v. 16) embraces both the association of the theophoric name *yirm*[e]*yāhû* with *yhwh* and an allusion to God's power as *'*[e]*lōhê ṣ*[e]*ḇā'ôṯ.*

The temple belongs to the domain where Yahweh is present in a special way, be-

cause it is called by his *šēm;* in the temple, too, God's expectations stand firm against human transgression. Its special character is expressed by the stereotyped formula *niqrā'-šᵉmî 'ālāyw;* this particular usage is limited to Jeremiah. Jer. 7:10 denies that the people come into Yahweh's presence in his house by virtue of its special character, since they are guilty of theft, murder, adultery, swearing falsely, and sacrificing to other gods (v. 9; cf. v. 30). Instead of following the instruction of Yahweh, they have turned away (32:34), turning the house of Yahweh into a den of robbers (7:11). Their false confidence is worthless, and Yahweh will destroy his house as an ineluctable warning. Their temporary repentance, followed immediately by renewed apostasy, will result in their enslavement (34:15-16). Yahweh will unleash devastating destruction in the very city that should be exemplary, because it is especially close to him on account of his name (25:29), but this is not the case.

The arguments in Dnl. 9:18-19 are precisely the opposite. Citing Jeremiah (9:2), Daniel launches into a collective confession and prayer, which states that the plea for restoration of the ruins is not made on the grounds of the people's own good deeds, but because the city bears God's name, so that there is an especially close relationship between Jerusalem and God.

The notion that the people are called by Yahweh's name never appears in Jeremiah; the texts employing this usage are late. In the early preexilic period, Isa. 63:18 surveys the dispersion of the people and the profanation of the temple. The speaker sounds almost resigned: it feels as though Yahweh had never been ruler over his people, as though his people had never been called by his name (v. 19). In a theophany Yahweh promises Solomon that he will help in time of need if the people humble themselves, pray, seek him, and turn away from their wicked ways. The words *niqrā'-šᵉmî 'ᵃlêhem* describing the people are inserted without particular emphasis, almost as an afterthought (2 Ch. 7:14). The motif of the battle with the nations is sounded in Am. 9:11-12. Israel and the house of David are to be restored, so as to overthrow Edom and all the nations "who are called by my name." The clause *niqrā'-šᵉmî 'ᵃlêhem* states Yahweh's legal claim to the peoples in question.

(2) Gen. 2:20 describes *hā'āḏām* as giving names to the various animals, without going into specific details. When Isaac redigs the wells dug in the days of Abraham, he gives them the names that his father had given them (26:18). Abram gives his son by Hagar the name Ishmael (16:15).

In the context of the distribution of the land, the Manassite Jair comes into possession of the territory of the Geshurites and the Maacathites, which he names after himself (Dt. 3:14). According to Josh. 19:47, the Danites conquered Leshem after a bloody battle. Their occupation of the city is linked with its renaming, so that the renaming becomes a token of sovereignty. They call it Dan, after their ancestor Dan.

While Absalom was still alive, he set up a memorial pillar because he was childless, which he named after himself *('al-šᵉmô)* in order to establish the self-reference (2 S. 18:18).

Joseph's position of special honor in the court of Pharaoh is signaled by the name Pharaoh gives him: *ṣāp̄ᵉnaṯ pa'nēaḥ,* "God speaks and he lives" (Gen. 41:45). This act

and Joseph's marriage to the daughter of an Egyptian priest, mentioned in the next breath, make Joseph a naturalized Egyptian.

A very few passages speak of someone who takes a new name: *qr'* niphal *'al-šēm* (Ezr. 2:61; Neh. 7:63).

We are told that Adam named his wife Eve ("Life") because she was to be the mother of all living (Gen. 3:20). Abraham saw a ram, which he offered up as a burnt offering instead of his son (Gen. 22:13). The place he named *yhwh yir'eh* (v. 14) — an etiology of a toponym containing the name of Yahweh. The theonym El is associated with the place that Gen. 32:31(30) calls *pᵉnî'ēl,* "face of God." This etiological element is based on the statement: "I saw *'ᵉlōhîm* face-to-face *(pānîm 'el-pānîm).*" Although the inclusion of *pānîm* is skillful, the difference between the two theonyms is striking. The whole scene is awkward in a passage already overburdened with etiologies.

When God gives a name, there may be an implicit threat: in Jer. 20:3 it is Yahweh, not the prophet, who has given Pashhur the name that embodies the peril facing all Israel: *māḡôr missāḇîḇ,* "terror on every side."

But naming can also betoken salvation and well-being. Yahweh will so intervene on behalf of his city Jerusalem (i.e., its people) that God's vindication will be visible (Isa. 62:2). The nations will be witnesses, and God's city will be called by a new name *(šēm ḥāḏāš).* But this name will be given by God's mouth, and it will open up for Jerusalem a new position among the nations. God's action and its universal effect coalesce, making possible the new position addressed by *šēm* — which is therefore not an individual "name."

Although Yahweh's closeness to his people finds expression in the God-given name "green olive tree of fair aspect" (Jer. 11:16), the Lord must foretell the disaster that the people have brought on themselves.

(3) We find simple naming of a child by the mother in Gen. 30:11,21; 38:4; Jgs. 13:24; 2 S. 12:24, and by the father in Gen. 5:3 (P); 21:3; 38:3; 41:51; Ex. 2:22. In 1 K. 7:21 (bis) names are given to pillars.

After Bathsheba named her second son Solomon, Yahweh, who loved the child, sent the prophet Nathan with a message for David (2 S. 12:25). At Yahweh's behest, David gave Solomon the familiar name *(qr' 'eṯ-šēm) yᵉḏîḏyâ,* "beloved of Yahweh." Nu. 32:37 states explicitly that the tribal leaders changed existing names: they gave names *(wayyiqrᵉ'û . . . 'eṯ-šēmôṯ)* to the towns they rebuilt. According to 2 K. 14:7, King Amaziah, despite being a faithful adherent of Yahweh, changed the name of a town from Sela to Jokthe-el. The reference to El suggests a pre-Israelite name, of obscure meaning.

Leah's name for her son Asher ("happiness") is derived from *'šr,* "call (someone) happy," since the women will congratulate her on the birth of another son. Ephraim's sons set out on a cattle raid and are killed by the people of Gath (1 Ch. 7:21); their father calls his next son *bᵉrî'â.* The interpretation of the name is based on the consonants *r',* which allow an etymological connection with "in disaster" *(bᵉrā'â).*

In a genealogy ascribed to a redactor (Gen. 4:25), Adam's wife gives the name Seth ("set") to her son born after Abel, on the grounds that God has set *(šāṯ)* him in the place of his brother, murdered by Cain. Seth calls his son Enosh ("human being," v. 26). The

comment that people at that time began to invoke the name of Yahweh is in conflict with Ex. 6:3 (P), which says that Yahweh first made himself known as Yahweh to Moses, not to the patriarchs. The purpose of Gen. 4:26 is to lay the groundwork for an alternative to the Cain tradition, since Enosh appeals to Yahweh's *šēm,* his empirical aspect.

Gen. 5:2 follows up on the creation of humankind in 1:27, adding that God called them both *(wayyiqrā' 'eṯ-šᵉmām) 'āḏām.* This is not a personal name but a statement qualifying the nature of humankind: the word *'āḏām* indicates enduring placement subordinate to God, the creator. Gen. 5:29 appears to continue J: Lamech names his son Noah ("rest") because Noah will bring relief (*nḥm* piel) with his hands instead of labor and toil. The allusion to Gen. 3:17 ameliorates God's curse on the ground.

In the context of the *bᵉrîṯ* established by God, Abram's name is also changed (Gen. 17:5), to mark the beginning of a new stage of his life. Naming thus influences a person's existential identity. It is dubious whether there is any etymological difference between *'aḇrām* and *'aḇrāhām.*[20] The name *'aḇrām* may be categorized as a theophoric Semitic name (similar to Eblaite names) meaning "the father-god [or: father of the gods] exalts"; in this context *'aḇ* is a divine appellative. Its polytheistic connotations are neutralized by making Abram the ancestor of a multitude of nations. The author heard in the new name *hmm,* "make a noise, disturb," or *hāmôn,* "hubbub, crowd." Also without stating a reason, God ordains that *śāray* be renamed *śārâ* (Gen. 17:15). Both words mean "princess." The point is therefore not the new name but the authority of God, who gives names and hence destinies. For Sarah, who is barren, this means that through God's blessing she will be an ancestor to nations (v. 16).

In Gen. 17:19 God commands Abraham — again without stating any reason — to call his son Isaac ("he laughs").[21] In fact, the motive has already appeared in v. 17, where Abraham prostrates himself before God in response to the promise of a son (v. 16), but laughs *(yiṣḥāq)* instead of worshiping. Leah names her sixth son Zebulun (Gen. 30:20); the name probably derives from *zbl,* which presumably means "dwell" (cf. *zᵉḇul,* "dwelling"), suggesting that (now) her husband will stay with her. But there are also overtones of the idea that in this scion God has given *(zbd)* a great gift *(zeḇeḏ).* In Gen. 30:24 Rachel's name for her son may be interpreted as an active participle or contracted hiphil of *ysp,* "add," since Yahweh has added to her another son. If *yôsēp̄* is an active form, it should actually be the son who adds; therefore the causative form is preferable, although the orthography is unusual and the imperfect form inexplicable, since Yahweh has already added the child.

The extended formula that changes Jacob's name to Israel in Gen. 35:10 outdoes the previous three clauses with *šēm.* The text is a positive declaration: *'ᵉlōhîm* calls his name *('eṯ-šēm)* Israel. Here we are not dealing with an etiology but with an authoritative decree, verbalized by use of the standard phraseology.

Hannah, thought to be barren and mocked by her rival, names her son Samuel (1 S.

---

20. J. Scharbert, *Genesis 12–50. NEB* (1986), 144.

21. → XIV, 62-63.

1:20). This is a name compounded with "El," which has nothing to do with the interpretation given by the text: for *(kî)* Hannah had asked *(š'l)* him of Yahweh (one would expect a name compounded with "Yahweh").

According to Jgs. 1:17, the tribes of Judah and Simeon defeated the Canaanites who inhabited Zephath and changed its name to Hormah, which is here derived from *ḥerem,* "total destruction," since they had devoted it to destruction (*ḥrm* hiphil). Omri bought the hill of *šōmᵉrôn* from Shemer (1 K. 16:24). There he built his royal residence. Strangely, he did not give the new town a name associated with one of the deities he worshiped or with himself, but with Shemer, the previous owner. This association is probably only literary, for the hill had long been called *šōmᵉrôn;* what is new is that the seat of government, which archaeological excavations have revealed to be impressive, was given this name. After a victory over the Philistines, Samuel set up a stone and called it *'eḇen hā'ēzer,* "stone of help" (1 S. 7:12), to commemorate the fact that thus far Yahweh had helped *('zr)* them. Since the name makes no reference to Yahweh, the name of the stone probably antedates Samuel.

A cult etiology of Bethel is associated with a dream of Jacob, in which he had seen a ladder on which the angels of Elohim were ascending and descending. Early the next morning, he took a stone, set it up as a sacred pillar, and poured oil on the top of it. The place was solemnly given a name: *bêṯ-'ēl,* "house of God" (Gen. 28:19). The name probably refers to an existing sanctuary; there is no hint that Jacob built any structure. Furthermore, the name is connected with El, although the text speaks of *'ᵉlōhîm* and the angels of *'ᵉlōhîm* (*mal'ᵃḵê 'ᵉlōhîm,* v. 12). The narrative also records that formerly the site had been called Luz. A different naming of the site of Jacob's vision is recounted in Gen. 35:15. After the theophany, Jacob set up a memorial pillar and poured both a drink offering and oil on it, establishing it as a cultic site. It was solemnly given a name: *bêṯ-'ēl.* Because the theophoric name compounded with "El" does not refer to the theophany of Elohim, it is clear that the name was already established before the association of the scene with Jacob.

In Nu. 11:34 another etiological popular etymology purports to explain the toponym *qiḇrôṯ hatta'ᵃwâ,* "graves of craving." God had sent quails in great numbers, which the people gathered day and night. Then Yahweh's anger was kindled and the people were struck with a great plague; hence the name of the site was interpreted as meaning "graves of craving," and those who had the craving were buried there.

In 2 Ch. 20:22 the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites are listed as enemies attacked by Jehoshaphat. After his victory, their camps were sacked for three days (v. 25). On the fourth day the people assembled and blessed *(bērᵃḵû)* Yahweh; therefore the place is called *'ēmeq bᵉrāḵâ,* "valley of blessing" (v. 26).

(4) Ex. 31:2 says that Moses, at Yahweh's behest, calls Bezalel by name, because God has endowed him with outstanding talents ("spirit") for the manufacture of cultic paraphernalia. To name cities or lands as one pleases *(bišmôṯām)* is to claim authority over them (Ps. 49:12[11]; cf. Nu. 32:38 [text?]). Yahweh calls by name all the stars created in the heavens (Isa. 40:26). The expression *bᵉšēm* has a specialized meaning in Isa. 44:5, where the prepositional phrase is used as a watchword. The text speaks of how individuals confess their association with Yahweh and the people he has delivered: one

says *lᵉyhwh ʾānî,* another *bᵉšēm-yaʿᵃqōḇ.* Only someone who is summoned by name *(niqrᵉʾâ bᵉšēm)* may come into the king's presence (Est. 2:14). Yahweh demands that the enemy release those who are called by his name (Isa. 43:7). In the postexilic period God still laments that people do not call on his name (Isa. 65:1) so that he can respond, "Here I am."

When Yahweh calls someone by name, it means that the person addressed (e.g., exiled Israel) belongs to him. Furthermore, it is proof of Yahweh's absolute supremacy that only he is truly able to call someone by name effectually — including the calling of Cyrus (Isa. 45:3).

Gen. 4:26 says that in the days of Enosh people began to invoke Yahweh *(bᵉšēm yhwh).* According to Gen. 21:33, Abraham planted tamarisks at Beer-sheba and there called on the name of Yahweh, with *ʾēl ʿôlām* added in apposition. The establishment of a sacred grove and the reference to El point to a Canaanite tradition. Since the text has to do with invocation of the deity, *bᵉšēm* cannot mean "in the name of," since there is nothing about the intended object of the calling or for what reason or purpose the name was called on. Thus *qārāʾ bᵉšēm yhwh* can refer only to invocation as such; the goal of the calling is named explicitly as Yahweh himself. Exactly the same situation obtains in those passages where Abraham builds an altar and calls *bᵉšēm yhwh* (Gen. 12:8; 13:2; 26:25). None of these texts adds anything about Abraham's purpose beyond the invocation of Yahweh himself.

Upon Moses' request to be allowed to see the glory of Yahweh, Yahweh says that he will make all his goodness pass before Moses' face. He also says that he will proclaim his name — i.e., "Yahweh." This act is equivalent to a self-revelation (Ex. 33:19; cf. similarly 34:5). In his contest with the prophets of Baal, Elijah proposes that his prophetic opponents first call on the name of their god (*bᵉšēm ʾᵉlōhêḵem,* 1 K. 18:24; cf. v. 25). V. 26 is almost unique in associating the standard phrase *qrʾ bᵉšēm* with Baal rather than Yahweh. Next, Elijah calls on *(bᵉšēm)* Yahweh. The deity who sets the sacrifice afire will prove to be God indeed. Naaman is disappointed that Elisha simply sends word that he should wash in the Jordan seven times. He had expected a theatrical gesture, in which Elisha would call on the name of Yahweh (2 K. 5:11). In a catastrophic disaster described in cosmic terms, only those will escape who call on the name of Yahweh (Joel 3:5[2:32]; cf. Ps. 116:4,13,17).

Rebuking the "gods," Yahweh declares that Cyrus, who tramples on rulers like clay, calls on "my name/me" (*bišmî,* Isa. 41:25) and not the gods. If Yahweh answers the people's prayer for help and protection, giving them life, they will call on him ("your name," Ps. 80:19[18]). It is a mark of recognition of Yahweh to make his deeds known among the nations and to call on him (*bišmô,* Isa. 12:4; Ps. 105:1; 1 Ch. 16:8). Contrariwise, it is an offense against Yahweh for no one to call on him (*bišmô,* Isa. 64:6[7]). If only a small fraction of the people survive, God will refine them as gold and silver are refined (Zec. 13:9). The positive result is that they will call on his name.

3. *Verbs of Perception.* Among verbs of perception, we note the following:

a. In one text (Mal. 3:16) the qal of *ḥšb* takes *šēm* as its object, with a pronominal suffix referring to Yahweh. The expression *yrʾ yhwh* is followed immediately by *ḥšb*

š^e^mô. People claim that it is vain to serve God, since it is the evildoers who prosper. Hearing this, God has a book prepared as a pregnant memorial *(zikkārôn),* in which are recorded those who revere Yahweh *(yir'ê yhwh)* and think on his name *(ḥōš^e^ḇê š^e^mô),* that they may be God's special possession on *the* day. The parallelism indicates that there is no qualitative distinction between *yhwh* and *šēm.*

b. In 11 texts *yd'* governs *šēm* (qal, niphal, hiphil), usually as direct object. The substantive is always determined by a suffix. When *yd'* is linked syntactically with *b^e^šēm,* the meaning differs from *yd'* with *šēm* as direct object. Our understanding of the usage is helped by the parallelisms in Ex. 33:12,17; Isa. 64:1(2); Ps. 9:11(10); 91:14.

In the context of a declaration that the end of Moab is at hand, those who know Moab's (proper) name (*yōḏ^e^'ê š^e^mô,* Jer. 48:17) are told to mourn. The text may imply that people identified Moab as a respectable political reality with a certain *šēm* ("fame").

In the revelation of Yahweh's name in Ex. 6:3, it is stated that Yahweh appeared to the patriarchs as El Shaddai, but did not make his name *(š^e^mî) yhwh* known to them. Here *šēm* means the proper name of God.

In Ex. 33:12-13 Moses in his uncertainty tries to elicit from Yahweh the identity of the leader who is to accompany Moses and the people on their journey. First he cleverly points out that God knows him by name *(b^e^šēm)* and that he has found favor *(māṣā'ṯā ḥēn)* in God's sight — and is therefore sure that he will receive an answer. The point here is not Moses' banal personal name but his personal identity; Moses humbly indicates that he is worried, as the ensuring dialogue shows (cf. vv. 13, 15-16).

Deutero-Isaiah interprets the various historical deportations of Israel as abduction at the hands of the "nations," discrediting God's *šēm.* But on the day when God's deliverance comes, the people will know God's name, when God says *hinnēnî,* "Here am I." Here too the point is not the name itself, but the substance of what Yahweh wishes to declare. Yahweh is and always has been on the side of the oppressed. Here *šēm* corresponds to what we mean by "essence" or "nature"; Biblical Hebrew has no other word for this concept. While Yahweh turns against Israel's external enemies, he makes his holy name known in Israel. All nations know that Yahweh is indeed Yahweh, the Holy One (Ezk. 39:7). The *šēm* means literally the proper name, but this proper name stands for the one who bears it, his power and his governance. Those who truly know Yahweh *(yd' šēm)* put their trust in him, for he never forsakes those who seek him (Ps. 9:11[10]; cf. 91:14).

Foreigners, too, when they learn of his great might *('eṯ-šim^e^ḵā haggāḏôl),* will come to the temple of Yahweh (1 K. 8:42). God, who dwells in all fullness in heaven, will hear their prayers there. Thus all the peoples will know "your name," because "your name" has been invoked on the house of Yahweh (8:43). Since the temple cannot contain Yahweh in all his divine fullness, God is present in the *šēm:* the name is the "limited" but real presence of Yahweh in a form accessible to mortals without peril. The prayer for God to come down as a devouring fire on the adversaries in order to make his *šēm* known (Isa. 64:1[2]) shows that it is God's mighty power that is at issue here.

c. In 3 passages *škḥ* (qal, hiphil) governs *šēm* as direct object. In a polemic against false prophets, Yahweh accuses them of deliberately undermining his worship. By their dreams they plan to make the people forget his name, just as their ancestors forgot

God's name — i.e., the elements of faith and experience associated with the name — and worshiped Baal instead (Jer. 23:27). Ps. 44:21(20) gives the impression of knowing Jer. 23:27 and drawing on its language.

4. *Verbs of Emotion.* Among the verbs expressing emotions, we note the following:

a. In 4 occurrences of *'hb* (qal, inf. [instead of noun] in Isa. 56:6; cf. Dt. 11:13,22; Josh. 22:5; etc.), the verb governs *šēm* as a direct object, determined by *yhwh* or a pronominal suffix. Constructions with poetic equivalents include the triad of infinitives in Isa. 56:6 *('hb — šrt — hyh),* the chiasmus in Ps. 5:12(11), and the parallelism in Ps. 69:37(36). Yahweh brings to his holy mountain the foreigners who have joined themselves to him by ministering to him, by loving the name of Yahweh, and by being his servants (Isa. 56:6). In the midst of the Dtr phraseology stands *šēm yhwh.* The alternation of terms shows clearly that this expression refers to Yahweh himself and is to be understood as a fuller form embodying the same meaning.

Ps. 5:12(11) distinguishes the worshipers of Yahweh from other groups by describing them as those who trust in him and love his name. "Trust" and "love" are related to each other in the same way as the suffix that refers to Yahweh and *šēm.* Nevertheless, there is an enhancement: while a suffix per se cannot represent Yahweh vicariously, *šēm,* connected unmistakably with Yahweh by the suffix, is quite able to represent the person of God (cf. in a different context 69:37[36]; 119:132).

b. There is only on instance of *ḥml* with *šēm.* Ezk. 36:16-21 expounds the reason for the catastrophe of the exile and speaks of the deliverance that God is about to take in hand. Israel defiled the land and was scattered among the nations; but "wherever they came, they profaned my [God's] holy name" — an allusion to the fact that the God who bears this very name (Yahweh) could not prevent the deportation (v. 20). "Therefore I had compassion on my holy name *('al-šēm qoḏšî),*" which means that Yahweh's purpose is Israel's return. Rehabilitation of the *šēm qōḏeš* causes Yahweh to intervene. The sphere of divinity finds expression in *qōḏeš.* Accordingly, *'al-šēm qoḏšî* means "for the sake of my own holiness."

c. There is also just one instance of *ḥtt* niphal with *šēm* (par. *yr'*). In Mal. 2:2 the prophet bitterly attacks the priests for not taking God seriously *(lāṯēṯ kāḇôḏ lišᵉmî);* therefore God will transform what had been a blessing into a curse and take action against them. God had established a covenant of life and well-being and had tried to prevent apostasy by instilling fear. Therefore the priests should take Yahweh seriously *(yîrā'ēnî)* and at the very least stand in awe of his name (v. 5). The *šēm* is identical with Yahweh, as we see from God's reaction when "the name" is not feared.

d. In 12 texts *yr'* (qal, niphal) is used with *šēm* (par. *kāḇôḏ* in Isa. 59:19 and Ps. 102:16). The phrase *yir'ê šēm* periphrastically denotes those who have a particularly close relationship with Yahweh. According to Mal. 3:20(4:2), the sun of righteousness rises for them. Ps. 61:5-6(4-5) describes them as enjoying God's hospitality; they can find refuge under his wings, and they receive their heritage from God.

Even when *šēm* refers to Yahweh, it can be understood in the sense of "fame," on account of the great and terrible things he has done in redeeming his people from Egypt (1 Ch. 17:21).

The name of God carries with it an aura of closeness to God. In Ps. 86:11 the psalmist asks Yahweh to direct his heart to fear God's name (cf. Neh. 1:11): then he can sing with a whole heart and glorify the name.

The terrible consequences of the curse (Dt. 28:15-57) take effect if Yahweh's instruction is not heeded and observed, "so that you fear this glorious and awesome name, Yahweh, your God" (v. 58). The parallelism of *haššēm* (introduced as obj. by *'eṯ*) and *yhwh 'ᵉlōheyḵā* and the qualification of *haššēm* by *hanniḵbāḏ wᵉhannôrā'* both show that the text identifies *šēm* and Yahweh. In Mal. 1:14 we find the additional motif of Yahweh's kingship. Because of what Yahweh does, the name *(šēm)* of Yahweh is reverenced among the nations and his glory feared. Here we are dealing with the forms in which people experience Yahweh's presence (cf. Ps. 102:16[15]). It is understandable that his great and awesome name should be praised, for he is also seen to be holy (99:3). This is a category that in its absolute sense can be predicated only of Yahweh (cf. 111:9).

5. *Verbs of Trusting.* Among the verbs signifying trust, we note the following:

a. The combination of *bᵉšēm* with *bṭḥ* (qal) occurs twice. The noun is determined in one case by *yhwh* as *nomen rectum,* in the other by *qoḏšô.* Both occurrences are in poetic texts, in which *bṭḥ* appears in parallel with *š'n* (Isa. 50:10) and *śmḥ* (Ps. 33:21). Isa. 50:10 encourages those who walk in darkness and have no light — presumably a reference to life in exile — to put their trust in the name of Yahweh. The counterpart to *bᵉšēm yhwh* is *bē'lōhāyw,* so that even the parallelism suggests that, although *šēm* does refer to the actual name, this name is so charged that it can be equated with God.

In Ps. 33 the worshipers rely on Yahweh, who is their help (v. 20). The clause that follows, introduced by *kî,* expresses the gladness produced by this reliance; then a further motivation is added, also introduced by *kî:* "for we trust in his holy *(qoḏšô)* name." The addition of *qoḏšô* brings *šēm* into the sphere of Yahweh, with whom it is in fact associated by the chiastic structure.

b. Only once does *ḥāsâ* appear in conjunction with *šēm.* In Zeph. 3:8 Yahweh appears as judge of the world. His purpose is not to destroy but to change all lips to pure lips, that all may call on the name of Yahweh and serve him with one accord. The Lord also forgives Israel's abominations and leaves in their midst a humble people that will seek refuge in him (*bᵉšēm yhwh,* v. 12).

c. The verb *qwh* also governs *šēm* once. Ps. 52 contrasts a person who relies on cunning and riches (vv. 3-9[1-7]) with the psalmist, who clings to Yahweh (vv. 10-11[8-9]). In the concluding verse the psalmist says: "I hope in your name." That *šēm* at the very least establishes an intensive form of relationship with the one who bears it is shown by *'ôḏᵉḵā,* with its direct reference to Yahweh, in the poetically corresponding position (v. 11a[9a]). The poem ends with this reference to trust in the one who is present in the name.

6. *Verbs of Motion.* Among the verbs of motion, we note the following:

a. Ten texts connect *bw'* (qal, hiphil) syntactically with *šēm;* the actual constructions vary greatly. First, *šēm* may function as the subject of the verb. It can also be goal of the

movement, in which case it is introduced by *'el, l^e,* or *'al.* In still other instances, it can be the purpose or errand, introduced by *b^e* or *l^{e}ma'an.* The qualifiers of *šēm* are *yhwh *^{e}lōhîm, yhwh ṣ^{e}ḇā'ôṯ, yhwh,* and *haggāḏôl.* The majority of occurrences have religious connotations.

In the context of Simeon's genealogy, 1 Ch. 4:34-37 lists a series of personal names. V. 38 says that those just named ("coming" [text?][22] *b^{e}šēmôṯ;* cf. v. 41: *hakk^{e}ṯûḇîm b^{e}šēmôṯ*) were leaders in their clans. The mention of "the names" without actually citing them serves here to identify a specific group of persons.

In Solomon's prayer of dedication, the author speaks of a foreigner who comes from a distant land "because of your [Yahweh's] name" (1 K. 8:41), having heard of Yahweh's great name and invincible might (v. 42; cf. 2 Ch. 6:32). Here *šēm* means Yahweh's personal name, with the honorable connotations associated with its bearer and his deeds. The language of Josh. 9:8-9 is closely related to that of these texts: pursuing their stratagem, the Gibeonites pretend to have come because of Yahweh's name (*l^{e}šēm yhwh,* v. 9). The pilgrimage to Yahweh's name recalls the demand to worship God in the full sense of the word (Deuteronomy refers to sacrifice) only in the place that God chooses. Here the Gibeonites single out the deliverance from Egypt and the victory over the Amorite kings during the occupation of Canaan to explain why they are coming to "this your God."

The contest between David and Goliath is skillfully described, using analogous language but with a twist. The Philistine comes to David with sword and spear and javelin; with the weapons, the prep. *b^e* conveys instrumentality. David comes *b^{e}šēm yhwh ṣ^{e}ḇā'ôṯ* (1 S. 17:45). As an individual, he retreats totally into the shadow of the one in whose name or at whose behest he comes (cf. Ps. 118:26, in a different context).

Isa. 60 develops the theme of the pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem. The most important goal is to return to *l^{e}šēm yhwh,* in parallel with *liqḏôš yiśrā'ēl* (v. 9). That "the Holy One" is interchangeable with "Yahweh" is clear; but *šēm* also comes close to being so: formally, at least, it stands on the same literary level as *qāḏôš.* The cosmos, too, is included when Yahweh assembles his dispersed people. The *šēm-yhwh* comes from far away (Isa. 30:27). Here the name is viewed as the actual presence of Yahweh, setting forth to deliver his people. The expression *šēm-yhwh* is, in the strict sense, interchangeable with *šēm; šēm* takes on the features that the texts dealing with the onslaught of the nations associate only with Yahweh. Since *yhwh* is the *nomen rectum* in v. 27, the statements that follow can refer to him alone.

b. There is one occurrence of *bûs,* "tread down," in conjunction with *šēm.* Ps. 44 is a communal lament; using archaic language, the worshipers say: "Through you we push down our foes [the image of an angry bull], *b^{e}šim^{e}ḵā* we tread down our assailants" (v. 6[5]). Here *šēm* serves as a variant of "God": it is introduced by *b^e,* and the suffix establishes a direct reference to God in the parallel stich.

c. Four passages, all late, link *hlk* (qal, hithpael) syntactically with *šēm.* Once *šēm* is the subject of the verb: 2 Ch. 26:8 says that King Azariah/Uzziah received tribute from

22. See *BHS.*

the Ammonites and his *šēm* spread even to the border of Egypt — clearly not just "fame" but also political influence.

Elsewhere *šēm* appears in a prepositional phrase. After citing several traditional parade examples of deliverance (at the sea, from Egypt, from Assyria), Zec. 10:12 foretells a new act of deliverance and restoration. At the end of the oracle, God declares: "I will make them strong in Yahweh," and in parallel: "and they shall walk in his name." Here *hlk* hithpael *bᵉšēm* refers to the conduct of life, i.e., "they shall live their lives" according to his *šēm*. The deliberately emphasized reference to the name points in turn to the one who bears it and its implications. Mic. 4:5 uses *hlk bᵉšēm* in the same sense. With an unusual openness, and without criticism or impugnment, the text states: "all the peoples walk (*hlk* qal), each in the name of its own God." The factor that distinguishes the nations is thus the *šēm* (probably to be understood collectively), the divine names, in which the gods who bear them are effectually present. The speakers differ only in specifying that they will walk in the name of Yahweh and define themselves by him alone.

d. In its 3 occurrences with *yṣ'* qal, *šēm* is always the subject; in its single occurrence with *yṣ'* hiphil, it is the direct object. The indirect object is introduced by *'al* or *lᵉ*. The noun is determined more precisely in various ways. As God had commanded, David struck down the Philistines; therefore his name *(šēm-dāwîḏ)* went out into all lands. The military context by itself is enough to show that *šēm* does not mean "fame" but the influence gained by force of arms, David's (military) power. According to 2 Ch. 26:15, Azariah/Uzziah rearmed Judah; therefore his name spread far — i.e., Azariah was known by name. This statement should not be understood as referring to his fame, but as the following statement *(kî-ḥāzāq)* implies, his (new) authority.

Dt. 22:13-21 deals with the case of a man who wishes to divorce his wife and therefore brings on her a bad name (*šēm rā'*, v. 14), i.e., a malicious imputation.

Jerusalem's faithlessness toward Yahweh is the primary theme of Ezk. 16. The city's magnificence is described in vv. 10-14. This theme is summarized in v. 14: "Your *šēm* spread among the nations on account of your beauty." In this context *šēm* refers to the esteem and fame enjoyed by the city, described metaphorically as an especially attractive woman.

e. The unique pual of *ngš* refers to sacrifice. In Mal. 1:1-10 Yahweh polemicizes against disrespectful offering of sacrifice and demands that the temple doors be shut. The motivation is provided by v. 11, in which *šᵉmî* is the catchword. The verse is made up exclusively of verbless clauses, two of which *(gāḏôl šᵉmî)* embrace the central clause like brackets: "Everywhere, among all nations, my name is great; everywhere incense offerings and pure gifts are offered to my name" — but not in Jerusalem. Since legitimate sacrifice can be offered only to Yahweh, in this passage *šēm* is clearly interchangeable with *yhwh*. The statement that the nations present offerings to Yahweh is unusual, and therefore the author surrounds it with the repeated verbless clause *gāḏôl šᵉmî*, surpassing human imagination.

f. In 3 of the 4 passages where *sbb* (hiphil, hophal) governs *šēm*, *'eṯ* introduces *šēm* as the direct object, with a reflexive suffix. In the one passive clause *šēm* is the subject. In 2 K. 23:34//2 Ch. 36:4, on the occasion of Pharaoh Neco's installation of Eliakim as

king, the stereotyped idiom *sbb* hiphil *'eṯ-š^{e}mô* describes the change of Eliakim's name to Jehoiakim. In 2 K. 24:17 the king of Babylon makes Mattaniah king and changes his name to Zedekiah. Primarily, the expression *sbb šēm* provides information about the change of name; secondarily, however, the context shows that it is a sign of the foreign king's power that he gives a new name, probably more than just a formal regnal name. The person renamed is subject to the one who gives the name. Sovereignty and power are also implicit in Nu. 32:38, where the Reubenites change the names of several towns that they rebuilt.

g. In one text (Hos. 2:19[17]) the hiphil of *swr* governs the dir. obj. *š^{e}môṯ*. In parallel with *h^{a}sîrōṯî 'eṯ-š^{e}môṯ* we find *lō'-yizzāḵ^{e}rû 'ôḏ*. Yahweh woos his faithless people, seeking a new beginning in the wilderness, in the hope that they will then be faithful to him willingly, that they will then address him as "Husband" rather than with the ambiguous "Baal/Master." Then Yahweh will make the names of the Baals vanish *(hēsîr)*. The phrase *š^{e}môṯ habb^{e}'ālîm* refers to all foreign deities, and should not be limited to Baal alone. In *šēm* — now in a polytheistic context — the author sees the deities themselves affected. They are present in the *šēm*. It is therefore consistent that when the names vanish no one will think at all of the other deities *(bišmām)*.

h. The verb *qwm* (qal, hiphil) occurs 4 times with *šēm* as its object. Once *'al* is used as an object marker. Dt. 25:5-10 deals with levirate marriage. When a man dies, his brother is to beget children by the widow of the deceased; the firstborn son raises up *(yāqûm)* the name *('al-šēm)* of the deceased brother once more (v. 6). The prepositional phrase *'al-šēm* is also used elsewhere when one person assumes the name of another. Here this usage implies that by receiving this new name the name bearer enters *(yāqûm)* into the genealogical line of his deceased uncle (cf. Ruth 4:5,10). The person is present in the name: the deceased is incorporated once more, in a new and more intensive way, into the existential continuum of the living rather than being blotted out *(lō'-yimmāḥeh š^{e}mô mîyiśrā'ēl)*.

Ezk. 34:29 stands in the midst of an oracle of deliverance, which promises that the yoke of the oppressor will be broken and that those who are saved will live in peace and security. Yahweh will provide for them a plantation *l^{e}šēm*, "per name, for each person." The tradent probably understood the (corrupt?) text in this sense, rather than emending *l^{e}šēm* to the possible original reading *šālôm* (LXX, Tg., Syr.), as the context suggests. Of course *maṭṭā' šālôm* is every bit as singular as *maṭṭā' l^{e}šēm*. There are internal reasons why the text was preserved in its present form, even if the original reading was *šālôm*.

7. *Verbs of Building, Setting, Resting.* Among verbs that denote building, setting, or resting, we note the following:

a. The verb *bnh* (qal, niphal) refers to the building of a *bayiṯ* (26 times) or *miqdāš* (once, 2 Ch. 20:8) for *(l^{e})* the *šēm* (*yhwh, yhwh '^{e}lōhāyw, yhwh '^{e}lōhê yiśrā'ēl, qoḏšeḵā*, and often with a suffix referring to God). A single secular text (1 K. 16:24) speaks of building a city *'al šēm*, "after the name," i.e., bearing the name of someone. (The only analogous formulation is significant: *hû' yiḇneh-bayiṯ liš^{e}mî* par. *w^{e}ḵōnantî 'eṯ-kissē' mamlaḵtô* [2 S. 7:13].) After consolidating his power, Omri builds a capital; the hill on

which it was built he had bought from a man named Shemer. So he builds the city of Samaria *ʿal šēm-šemer,* "after the name of Shemer." The noun *šēm* is employed to explain the name of the city.

In the ancient Near East, every influential deity was obviously entitled to a temple (see, e.g., the disputes in Ugaritic texts between Yam and Baal over the building of a palace). For the building of this temple, Dtr theology uses phraseology with *bnh bayiṯ lᵉšēm* at its core. The name is present in the temple (cf. the verbless clause *šimᵉkā babbayiṯ hazzeh* in 2 Ch. 20:9; also 1 K. 8:16-17,20). The first passage to mention David's intention to build a temple (2 S. 7:2, "for the ark"; v. 5 [spoken by Yahweh], "for me") states that God will establish a dynasty (house) for David, while David's successor will build a house *lišmî* (v. 13; cf. 1 K. 8:19; 2 Ch. 6:9). There is no detectible difference in meaning between *tiḇneh . . . bayiṯ* (v. 5) and *yiḇneh-bayiṯ* (v. 13). The one for whom the house is built is identified in the former by *lî,* in the latter by *lišmî,* so that *šēm* is equated with Yahweh as the one to whom the temple is dedicated (cf. 1 K. 8:16 and 2 Ch. 6:5: *lihyôṯ šᵉmî šām*). In his name Yahweh is present in his house.

This notion can be clarified by 1 K. 3:2, which states that the people were sacrificing like the Canaanites on the high place because no house had yet been built for the name of Yahweh *(lᵉšēm yhwh).* According to the Dtr line of argument, the house of Yahweh is that place in which the sacrifices are offered. Of course they are offered not to the name but to Yahweh himself; in no text is *zbḥ* or *ʿlh* (or any other sacrificial term) associated directly with *šēm,* so that sacrifice is offered to the name. This observation suggests that a distinction must be maintained between *šēm* and Yahweh in many areas where the intensity of Yahweh's presence is critical.

The DtrH and parallel passages in ChrH often speak of David's intention (1 K. 8:17; 1 Ch. 28:3; 2 Ch. 6:7-8) and his desire to bring the holy vessels into the house built for the name of Yahweh (1 Ch. 22:19). At the same time, building "the house for the name" is a sign that recognizes God's omnipotence (1 Ch. 29:16). According to Solomon, adverse external circumstances prevented David from building a house *lᵉšēm yhwh* (1 K. 5:17[3]; Solomon will now carry out David's purpose (v. 19[5]; 2 Ch. 1:18[2:1]; 2:3[4]). This house of God will also be available to foreigners, who can pray toward it (1 K. 8:42; 2 Ch. 6:32; cf. praying for Israel's deliverance from captivity, 1 K. 8:48; 2 Ch. 6:38) and God will hear them.

In 2 Ch. 20:7-8 we find the annexation tradition that God drove out the inhabitants of the land before the people of Israel in order to give the land to the descendants of Abraham. After the Israelites settled, they immediately built a sanctuary *(miqdāš)* for the name (v. 8). More than *bayiṯ, miqdāš* emphasizes that the building belongs to Yahweh, not to the people.

b. In 19 passages *šēm* or *šēmôṯ* is the subject of *hyh* (qal). The range of usage is broad. In Ps. 113:2 and Job 1:21, the short jussive form of *hyh* is syntactically necessary to establish the connection between the subject and the predicative pual participle. We are told in 1 S. 8:2 that the name *(šēm)* of the older was (*hyh* as auxiliary verb) Joel, the name *(šēm)* of the younger Abijah. A special form of this construction is used when the text says that a name is adopted *(hyh ʿal šēm;* cf. also *qrʾ ʿal-šēm* and *bnh ʿal-šēm).* The stones attached to the breastpiece of the priest, which is artfully adorned with pre-

cious stones, are inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes (Ex. 28:21: *'al-šēm/ šᵉmôṯ* [3 times]). Besides the much commoner verbless clause *'ēlleh šᵉmôṯ*, "these (are) the names," we also find *hyh* used as an auxiliary verb: *wayyihyû-'ēlleh . . . bišmōṯām* (Nu. 3:17), followed in each case by the list of names.

In Gen. 17:5, in the context of the change of Abram's name to Abraham, *hāyâ* (perfect tense stating a fact) plays the role of an auxiliary verb. Here *šēm* means the actual name as spoken. The expression *yihyeh šᵉmeḵā* fulfills the same function in the change of Jacob's name to Israel (Gen. 35:10; cf. 1 K. 18:31).

By Yahweh's own admission, he prevented David from building him a house on account of David's wars and bloodshed; but David before his death once more charges his son Solomon with the task of building the temple (1 Ch. 22:5-6). Solomon will be "a man of peace," because Yahweh will establish peace on his behalf. Therefore his name will be *(yihyeh šᵉmô)* Solomon *(šᵉlômôh)*, derived from *šālôm* and *šeqeṭ* ("peace and quiet," v. 9).

Descriptions of Solomon's qualities particularly emphasize his wisdom. It surpassed that of several non-Israelites, otherwise unidentified but presumably well known in Israel, whose names are recorded as Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Darda (1 K. 5:11[4:31]). In the same verse we are told that "his name was *(šᵉmô wayᵉhî)* throughout all the surrounding nations." Here *šēm* denotes an individual name, like those just listed. Since incomparable wisdom was also associated with him, there are also overtones of "fame."

Ezk. 23:10 also has to do with fame, but in the sense of "obloquy." The chapter describes Israel and Judah as sisters who offered themselves to every suitor who came their way. Therefore Yahweh delivered them into the hands of their lovers, who were unmasked as bloodthirsty men of violence (a reference to the Neo-Assyrians). They raped and murdered the sisters, who became a byword among the women *(wattᵉhî-šēm lannāšîm)*, i.e., other imperiled nations.

The royal descendant in whom Ps. 72 places great hope is never named, but the psalm describes the astonishing results of his fabulous reign, affecting all creation. V. 17 expresses the wish that his name *(šᵉmô)* may endure *(yᵉhî)* effectually forever, and flourish in the sight of the sun — possibly an ancient topos from the time when the sun was worshiped as a deity. In this case the name stands for its bearer; *šēm* denotes his essential nature.

In the address to the assembly of Israel in which Solomon states his reasons for building the temple (1 K. 8:14ff.), he cites an oracle given to David, which says that until then God had not chosen a city in which to build a house. The house is to be built so that the name of Yahweh may be there (*lihyôṯ*, v. 16; cf. v. 29; 2 K. 23:17; 2 Ch. 6:5). Here *hyh* does not serve to link two nominal elements: it declares that the name will be *present* there. The infinitive introduces the element of facticity associated with a verbless clause. Yahweh's *šēm* is so precious to him that he takes a long time to find a proper place for it, and he chooses this place explicitly. In 2 Ch. 6:6 and 33:4, Jerusalem is referred to *expressis verbis* as the place chosen.

In most passages the connotations associated with *šēm* in this context are relatively meager; they are abundant, however, in 2 Ch. 7:16. Not *eo ipso* but because Yahweh

has chosen this house, set it apart, and consecrated it, it is a fit place for the *šēm,* as well as Yahweh's eyes and heart, to be forever. Since the author places the eyes and heart on the same plane as *šēm,* the latter also means the concrete "name." But just as eyes and heart as "organs" of God must be understood figuratively, so too must *šēm.* It clearly refers to the personal presence of God, unlimited but intimate and attentive. Nevertheless, human idiom preserves the difference between the actual presence of God and the side of God available to human experience.

c. There are 21 occurrences of *śym* (qal) with *šēm* as its direct object, often with a pronominal suffix referring to Yahweh. When *śym* has a locative meaning, even in an extended sense, it is constructed with *ʿal;* the indirect object is marked by *lᵉ.* Dtn/Dtr diction makes frequent use of the expression *lāśûm (ʾeṯ) šēm šām.* The idiom *śym ʾeṯ šēm* means refers to naming. For example, Gideon "sets" the name Abimelech for the son of his concubine, probably just a normal act of naming (Jgs. 8:31). The Chaldean king (according to Dnl. 1:7, a high court official) "set" for Daniel the name *(śām-šᵉmēh)* Belteshazzar, a common name for a "Babylonian," but for Daniel a change of his former appellation. Neh. 9:7 refers to the election of Abraham *(bāḥartā bᵉʾāḇrām),* evidenced by God's bringing him out of Ur of the Chaldeans and giving him the name *(wᵉśamtā šᵉmô)* Abraham. The latter argument is meaningless unless one knows that "Abram" is changed to "Abraham" in Gen. 17:5.

In 2 S. 7:22 the pen of a later author has David utter a prayer praising the greatness and incomparability of Yahweh. Yahweh's people are also called a unique nation *(gôy ʾeḥāḏ)* — a description probably targeted for criticism. This nation is singled out by the fact that God went to redeem *(pdh)* it and to make a name for it *(lāśûm lô šēm)* — which means that Yahweh made it famous. This fame, however, rests not on the great deeds done by Israel but on the mighty acts performed by Yahweh (v. 23; cf. 1 Ch. 17:21).

In Zeph. 3:18-19 Yahweh foretells the end of the disaster that has befallen Israel. Instead of shame *(bōšeṯ),* Yahweh will "set" his people as praise *(liṯhillâ)* and renown *(lᵉšēm).* This formulation has the following implications: the "setting" is a sign of Yahweh's effectual intervention; it affects the nations, which will enjoy respect and renown in the eyes of the other nations.

The summary of the Aaronic blessing says that those who perform the rite set *(śāmû)* Yahweh's name on the Israelites (Nu. 6:27); the perfect tense stands within the description of the rite and emphasizes the factitious aspect of what is done. The name is accordingly a reality that an authorized cultic official, with divine guidance, can apply to others. It does not replace Yahweh, for it is Yahweh who blesses, not his *šēm.* It remains true, of course, that the words of Nu. 6:24-27 substantiate a particularly close relationship with God, summarized by the expression "my name."

According to Dt. 12:4-5, the place that Yahweh chooses replaces the cultic sites of the other religions. This place is qualified as the place where Yahweh puts *(śûm)* his name, that it may dwell there *(lᵉšiḵnô).* The addition of *škn* underlines the reification of the name, which remains as a resident presence. It is no longer statues and the like that represent Yahweh's presence but rather his name. This mode of God's presence sets Yahwism apart from the crude notion that sees God's presence in tangible idols or

groves (cf. the polemic against Manasseh in 2 K. 21:4,7; 2 Ch. 33:7). It is not clear that this language is aiming at an abstract theological statement.[23] It is significant that sacrifices and cultic offerings are (Dt. 12:5; tithes, 14:24) or should be (12:21) brought to the place Yahweh has chosen "to put his name there" (*lāśûm 'eṯ-š^emô šām:* 12:5,21; 14:24; 1 K. 9:3; 11:36; 14:21; 2 Ch. 6:20; 12:13; similarly 2 K. 21:7; 2 Ch. 33:7; restricted to Jerusalem: 2 K. 21:4; 2 Ch. 33:7), but they are never offered to the name itself. This observation points to a distinction between *šēm* and Yahweh, but does not rule out a particularly intensive form of God's presence (1 K. 9:3). The ChrH sees this presence very clearly. We hear Solomon's prayer that Yahweh will watch day and night over the place where his name is present, that he may (speedily) hear the prayers of the people (2 Ch. 6:20). The expression is included in 1 K. 11:36 as a theological argument to guarantee Solomon's succession in the Davidic dynasty (cf. 1 K. 14:21; 2 Ch. 12:13).

d. In 10 passages *škn* (qal, piel) governs *šēm* as direct object (in one case the word itself is not used but appears in the form of a pronominal suffix attached to the infinitive). It is noteworthy that almost every instance is an independent infinitive clause. Most of the occurrences (7) read *l^ešakkēn šēm šām.* There are 7 occurrences in Deuteronomy, 1 in Jeremiah, and 2 in ChrH. The name in question is always that of Yahweh.

When the people enter into the heritage allotted by God and enjoy rest from their enemies (Dt. 12:10), the law takes effect that requires all sacrifices and offerings to Yahweh to be brought (only) to the place that Yahweh chooses as a dwelling for his *šēm* (v. 11; cf. 26:2). We are told that the *šēm* dwells (perpetually) in the temple (cf. 12:5 — qal, in contrast to all other occurrences) and does not simply become present ad hoc in a theophany. The possibility of this presence is so important that no sacrifice should be offered elsewhere: there is thus a clear difference between the *šēm* and Yahweh himself (cf. 14:23). This requirement holds true particularly for the animals sacrificed at the Passover festival (16:2,6). Nothing is said about what is to be done in remote areas — or was Passover celebrated only in Jerusalem, as 16:6-7 requires? The tension between 16:6-7 and 14:24 cannot be ignored.

This highly specific presence of Yahweh in his *šēm* has marked social consequences. At the Festival of Weeks there is to be great rejoicing among the celebrants — the cultic congregation comprises all Israel, the entire population: full citizens, their children, and above all the socially disadvantaged — slaves, Levites (their presence in the list appears to presuppose their impoverishment), strangers, orphans, and widows (Dt. 16:11).

The author of Jer. 7:9-15 had the stock expression "the place where I made my name dwell" ready to hand, but used it in the context of a horrible example. To the initial triad of offenses (stealing, murder, adultery) is joined a second, which draws on Dtr themes: swearing falsely, making offerings to Baal, going after other gods. There follows the charge that the people nevertheless count on Yahweh's help without any sense of guilt, presuming on Yahweh's presence in the temple, which is called by his name

23. As claimed, e.g., by Grether and von Rad.

(vv. 9-10). Speaking for Yahweh, the prophet cites the horrible example of Shiloh, "where I first made my name to dwell." It is this misjudgment that leads to catastrophe: although the *šēm* of Yahweh is indeed still present, those who live under its shadow pay it no heed.

This stock formula is little used in ChrH, and then only in a different context. This change is all the more striking in that the Dtn/Dtr expression *śîm šēm* is incorporated regularly throughout. According to Ezr. 6:1-12, Darius reinstated the edict of King Cyrus ordering the rebuilding of the temple. As a theological argument, it is stated that the God who has established his name there will overthrow any king or people who contravenes the edict (v. 12). According to Neh. 1:9, when the people return to Yahweh, he will gather them from the ends of the earth and bring them to the place at which he has chosen to make his name present. Here what had formerly been a pregnant interpolation serves as a pompous circumlocution for the city name "Jerusalem."

e. In Isa. 65:15 *nwḥ* governs *šēm* as a direct object. In a context describing the terrible things that will befall those who worship other gods, v. 15a leads up to the climax. In contrast to the servants of Yahweh, who will sing with gladness, those who worship other gods will wail in anguish (v. 14). Then they must be prepared to leave (*nwḥ* hiphil) their *šēm* to be used as a curse by the chosen. The name identifies in a single word the entire life experienced by a human and represents it symbolically. It is also implicit that annihilation of the name signals the destruction of the final phase of human existence.

8. *Verbs of Destruction.* Among the verbs denoting destructive action, we note the following:

a. Twice *'bd* (qal, piel) is associated with *šēm*. The meaning of the expression *'bd šēm* is illustrated by Ps. 41:6(5). The psalmist begs Yahweh to be gracious and confesses having sinned. His enemies have turned on him and wonder when he will finally die *(yāmûṯ)* and when his name will perish *('āḇaḏ šᵉmô)*. The speakers cannot count on the destruction of the psalmist's name as in simply being forgotten. They themselves would bear witness to the opposite. At the same time the use of the active voice rules out the notion of a *damnatio memoriae.*[24] "Die" and "name perish" can therefore be equated. In this context "name" stands for the actual person and is therefore an anthropological term.

In Dt. 12:2-3 the demand to demolish the cultic sites of the nations, break down their altars, smash their pillars, burn their sacred poles, and hew down the idols of their gods means total destruction, formulated as "blotting out their name from this place" (v. 3). It is interesting that *šēm* is in the singular, whereas the suffix refers to a multiplicity of gods. The *šēm* thus stands for the divine individuality, analogous to the individuality of the human person.

b. The verb *bzh* appears twice with *šēm* as its object. Since *bzh* denotes an action, not a verbal utterance, it is not classed with the verbs of speaking. According to Mal.

---

24. F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Psalmen I. NEB* (1993), 263.

1:6, the priests are despisers of Yahweh's name *(bôzê šᵉmî)*, because they offer polluted food on the altar (v. 7). Since the sacrifices are dedicated directly to Yahweh, *šēm* here stands in the place of Yahweh.

c. One text (Nah. 1:14) uses *zrʿ* with *šēm*. Yahweh advances on the Assyrian capital to destroy it utterly: its name shall be sown no longer *(lō'-yizzāraʿ miššimᵉḵā)*. This expression should be understood as "you will beget no offspring," since here *šēm* refers not to a personal name but to the figure bearing the name, which lives on in descendants.

d. Twelve texts link *ḥll* (piel, pual, hiphil) syntactically with *šēm*. The noun is usually the direct object; in one instance *šᵉmeḵā* appears as *nomen rectum* with *miškan*, the direct object of *ḥll* piel (Ps. 74:7). The coupling of *šēm* with *qoḏšî* (7 times) or *'ᵉlōhîm* (3 times; never Yahweh) as *nomen rectum* is strikingly frequent. Most occurrences are in Leviticus and Ezekiel. In Ezk. 20:9,14,22; 36:22,23, *šēm* appears in the independent clause, but is not repeated (with *ḥll* as verb) in the dependent clause, where we may speak of a suppressed object.

In Am. 2:7 the holy name is profaned by ethically reprehensible conduct: father and son have sexual intercourse with the same woman.

In Ezk. 39:7 the argument is couched in political terms: Yahweh takes the field against his opponents and makes his holy name known in his people Israel — i.e., his support is to be made public. Like other nations, Israel associates its historical experience with the name of its own God (Ezk. 36:20). The statement "I will no longer let my holy name be profaned (*ḥll* hiphil)," with the result that the nations will know that Yahweh is "holy" (different and unique) in Israel, includes monotheistic elements. What is meant by *šēm-qōḏeš* is more than the divine name: it is Yahweh's uniquely manifested essence, which he henceforth refuses to see profaned.

That the actual theonym "Yahweh" as used in the cult is implicit in the expression *ḥll* piel *šēm* is clear from Lev. 19:12, where *šbʿ* niphal *bᵉšēm* parallels *ḥll* piel *šēm*. To the prohibition against swearing falsely "in my name" is added immediately (consec. pf. with *wᵉ*): "and (thus) profane the name of your God." The stylistic nature of the construction shows that an appended clause introduced by *wᵉ* can express a consequence.[25] The authoritative motivating clause *'ᵃnî yhwh*, added asyndetically, appears in Lev. 18:21 in the law prohibiting the sacrifice of one's offspring to Molech. The text continues: ". . . and thus profane [*wᵉlō' tᵉḥallēl*, 'lest you profane'] the name of your God" (cf. 20:3). It is obvious that actions which might be understood as cultic elements of other religions (e.g., shaving a bald spot or gashing one's flesh) would occasion profanation of God's name (21:6; cf. Ezk. 20:39). Here, as in many other passages, *šēm* stands vicariously for the person in question: it is Yahweh who is disavowed by forms of worship associated with other gods (cf. Lev. 22:2,32 with respect to the handling of sacrificial offerings by the priests).

In Ps. 74:7 *šēm* means more than the theonym "Yahweh" as a divine, effectual actuality. The name had been in the destroyed sanctuary, in its dwelling place. Only one

25. *GK*, §112m.

who can make use of a dwelling needs the dwelling. Thus *šēm* refers to Yahweh, present in the sanctuary — or, to put it another way, Yahweh is present in his *šēm* in the sanctuary. Its destruction, as during the exile, is equivalent to a profanation.

e. In 3 passages *ṭm'* (qal, piel) governs *šēm* (for parallel expressions cf. Lev. 19:12 and Ps. 74:7). When Jerusalem had defiled herself by shedding blood and worshiping idols, God wanted to make the city a disgrace before the nations (Ezk. 22:4) because she had defiled the name (*ṭāmē'ṯ haššēm,* v. 5). "The name" (with article and without suffix) that Jerusalem defiled refers to Yahweh himself; he is the very antithesis to the gods, and Jerusalem has sullied him.

In Ezk. 43:7-9, in the description of the new order of salvation and God's presence, represented by the temple, there is an interpolation in which the expression *ṭm'* piel *šēm* occurs twice. After the assurance that this is the place where God's throne stands and where God's feet rest, we hear unexpectedly that neither the house of Israel nor its kings shall defile the holy name *(šēm qoḏšî).* The interpolator equates Yahweh with *šēm qoḏšî,* at the same time emphasizing the need to accept the new order, which rules out the association of temple and palace. The propinquity of the palace breeds abominations that have defiled God's holiness (perfect tense, stating a fact).

f. The verb *krt* occurs 4 times with *šēm.* A (relatively) fulfilled life is associated with the use of a name. This is clear in Ruth 4:10, which speaks of maintaining a name *(lᵉhāqîm šēm)* in order that it not be cut off (*krt* niphal). One of the reasons Boaz marries Ruth is to keep the name of her departed husband represented among his kindred and the local citizenry, so that it may continue to have legal standing. As long as the possibility exists that a wife may bear offspring for her departed husband through a relative, the dead man is not totally cut off from the living.

In Isa. 14:4-23 a late poet envisions Yahweh executing paradigmatic judgment on Babylon. The vivid imagery of the onslaught of the nations concludes with an oracle of Yahweh: "I will cut off from Babylon name *(šēm)* and remnant, offspring and posterity." When this happens, not simply physical death but total annihilation is ordained.

During the occupation of Canaan, Joshua fears that the Amorites, Canaanites, and other inhabitants of the land will destroy the people and cut off (*krt* hiphil) their name (Josh. 7:10). Just as the names "Amorites" and "Canaanites" refer to concrete people, so they will exterminate concrete people: "cut off the *šēm*" is a Hebraism meaning "wipe out."

g. The verb *mḥh* (qal, niphal) governs *šēm* 4 times as direct object. In one instance Yahweh is the subject. Pronominal suffixes specify the referent. Religious elements always appear in the context. The phrase *mittaḥaṯ haššāmayim* is a Dtn/Dtr feature. Complaining that the people are being stubborn (Dt. 9:13), Yahweh considers destroying Israel and starting over again with Moses. According to v. 14, he will destroy them and blot out *(mḥh)* their name forever. Obliteration of the name is an intensifying element, as the expression "from under heaven" shows, conveying the totality of the result. The word *šēm* refers to all the people, each of whom has a particular name. But the focus is on the fact that *šēm* embodies an aspect of the person that can be reactivated even beyond the boundary of death. When God does undertake to destroy, destruction is final, so that a new beginning is necessary.

If the people turn to other gods (Dt. 29:16ff.), Yahweh will be so enraged that he will be unwilling to pardon them. Instead, Yahweh will blot out "their name," i.e., make them vanish utterly. In the context of Dtr argumentation, Yahweh sees Israel's affliction after apostasy and sends someone to help, since he does not intend the total destruction of Israel (*limḥôṯ 'eṯ-šēm yiśrā'ēl,* 2 K. 14:27).

In an expression of utter despair, the beleaguered speaker of Ps. 109 wishes various forms of disaster on his enemy. The physical afflictions culminate in v. 13, in the wish that the enemy's posterity be cut off and, going even a step further, that his name (emending the suffix *-ām* to *-ô*) be blotted out in the very next generation. In contrast to Ps. 109, the enemy in Ps. 9 is collective: the nations. Yahweh acts as judge by holding them in check or destroying them (v. 6[5]). In parallel stands the blotting out of their name forever and ever. The perfect tense bespeaks facticity and the position (second element of the parallelism) suggests a climax. The result is declared in v. 7(6): the enemies have vanished.

h. The piel participle of *ndh* is used with the phrase *lᵉma'an šᵉmî* in Isa. 66:5. In the postexilic period the Israelites have been going their own way and worshiping foreign deities (vv. 1-4). Therefore Yahweh will take action: he knows those who tremble at his word and are hated and rejected by their fellow Israelites "on account of my name" (*lᵉma'an šᵉmî,* v. 5). In this context those who hate them are cultic officials, who are attacked on account of their worship (which Yahweh rejects).

i. There is only one occurrence of *nṭš* with *šēm.* Although the people have turned against Yahweh by wishing for a king, Yahweh — when they have repented — will not cast them away "for the sake of his great name" (1 S. 12:22). In *šēm* coalesce the sense of "for his own sake" and the predisposition toward deliverance expressed in the name.

j. There is also only a single occurrence of *rqb* with *šēm.* In strict parallelism Prov. 10:7 contrasts *zēḵer* and *šēm, ṣaddîq* and *rᵉšā'îm, liḇrāḵâ* and *yirqāḇ.* While *zēḵer* and *šēm* can denote ordinary names, they can also be used figuratively, as here. The point is the potential that the bearer of the name realizes and the resulting consequences. In the case of the *rᵉšā'îm,* their personal identity rots away.

k. Twice *šmd* (niphal, hiphil) occurs with *šēm.* In 1 S. 24:22(21) Jonathan makes David promise not to slay his descendants, i.e., we are dealing here with physical death. This is probably also the sense of the par. *tašmîḏ 'eṯ-šᵉmî mibbêṯ 'āḇî.* Isa. 48:18 pictures the results that obedience to the law would have had: prosperity, success like a flood of refreshing water, and a multitude of descendants. Israel's name would never be cut off *(krt)* or destroyed *(šmd).* The expressions *krt* and *šmd šēm* denote the physical destruction of a person, but the state of those held captive in exile may be described as a living death.

9. *Other Verbs.* Several verbs resist categorization.

a. *bqš.* Ps. 83:14-16(13-15) prays that Yahweh will make the enemy blow away like dust and chaff — not to destroy them, but so that, with their faces filled with shame, they seek Yahweh's name (v. 17[16]). They are to know that his name is Yahweh. Yahweh and *šēm* are interchangeable.

b. *g'l.* In the postexilic period of unrest, the people pray that Yahweh will once again

grant them love and compassion. Their prayer is based on two central themes: *'attâ yhwh 'āḇînû* and *mē'ôlām šᵉmeḵā gō'ᵃlēnû* (Isa. 63:16). The words *yhwh* and *šēm, 'āḇ* and *gō'ēl* stand in synonymous parallelism. We are to understand *šēm* as being interchangeable with the divine name, not simply structurally but also substantially.

c. *gdl.* In the promise to Abraham, Yahweh vows to make of him a great nation, to bless him, and to make his name great (Gen. 12:2). Fame and esteem are implicit in *šēm;* these are associated with Abraham's imputed genealogical status, for with him Israel comes into being. David prays that God will do as promised, that God's name may be magnified (2 S. 7:26; cf. 1 Ch. 17:24). The passage, admittedly highly anthropomorphic, focuses on the esteem in Yahweh should be held.

At the beginning of Ps. 138:2, joy guides the psalmist, who gives thanks to the name for Yahweh's steadfast love and faithfulness, because Yahweh has made great his name and word (*'imrâ;* the term indicates a late date for the psalm). Just as *ḥeseḏ* and *'ᵉmeṯ* come from Yahweh himself (so that *šēm* may be equated with him), so name and word constitute a special mode of God's presence, which nevertheless preserves a difference between the divine plenitude and human experience.

d. *dgl.* In Ps. 20 a prayer that God will help and support the king is followed by rejoicing over the king's victory. With equal enthusiasm the speakers raise their banners in the name of God (v. 6[5]). As described here, God functions like a spring driving someone who hopes to gain victory in God's name.

e. *znh.* Ezekiel's description of faithless Jerusalem uses the image of a prostitute for Jerusalem. The unique expression "you played the whore" *(tiznî) 'al-šᵉmēḵ* (Ezk. 16:15) means that she gave her real name freely, whereas one would at least expect her to camouflage her identity under a false name. That absolute self-exposure is meant is clear from the statement that follows: the city devotes herself totally to her whoring.

f. *yṭb.* David is told that Solomon, the new king, has been greeted by his servants with the acclamation "May God make the name of Solomon better than yours [sc. David's]" (1 K. 1:47). Here, as the context shows, the text has less to do with fame than with power and influence.

g. *yqr.* In the wars with the Philistines, David registered more success than other followers of Saul. Thus (lit.) "his name became precious" (1 S. 18:30) — meaning his (military) esteem and associated fame became greater.

h. *yš'* (hiphil). Ps. 54:3(1) begins immediately with a cry for help: "Save me by your name, vindicate me by your might." The name itself does not save, but a reality that goes hand in hand with a "name." As the context (victory over enemies) shows, *šēm* does not mean an appellative but a position of power. This interpretation is supported by the par. *gᵉḇûrâ.* The prep. *bᵉ* that introduces both nouns denotes both motivation and means. This understanding finds further support in Ps. 106:8, which states that Yahweh saved Israel's ancestors in Egypt *lᵉma'an šᵉmô,* thus making his mighty power known.

i. *kbd.* In Ps. 86 the poor and needy psalmist's cry for help refers in its argumentation to foreign gods and nations. The latter come to the Lord because he is their creator. They glorify his name (v. 9) because he — God — does wondrous things. The name, which is the object of worship, is exalted because it signifies or establishes the presences of its bearer. The same holds true for the psalmist, to whom God teaches the right

way, so as to fear God's name only. The psalmist gives thanks to God by glorifying God's name (v. 12); i.e., this verse equates *šēm* with God.

j. *kpr.* In Ps. 79 a prayer for forgiveness of sins (v. 8) is followed by a cry for help (v. 9), which employs assonance, concluding the second and fourth hemistichs (v. 9b,d) with the same word *(šᵉmeḵā):* "Help us for the glory of your name, forgive *(wᵉḵappēr)* our sins for the sake of your name." The undertones of deliverance in the name "Yahweh" may stand in the background.

k. *ktb.* According to 1 K. 21:8, Jezebel wrote the letter that was to cost Naboth his life in the name *(bᵉšēm)* of her husband. Here *bᵉšēm* refers to the authority implicit in the citation of the personal name (cf. in a different context Est. 3:12; 8:8[bis],10). Nu. 17:16ff.(1ff.) describes how Aaron was incorporated into the genealogical tradition of the tribes: Moses is instructed to write Aaron's name on the staff of Levi (v. 18[3]). Here *šēm* denotes the personal name (cf. v. 17[2]; in a different context, Ezk. 24:2).

l. *mwl/myl.* The stereotyped expression *bᵉšēm yhwh kî ʾᵃmîlam* (Ps. 118:10-12) seems to be a secondary addendum to v. 12, inserted to maintain the triadic structure. The precise meaning of the much-discussed verb *ʾᵃmîl,* "fend off" (?), is not given by the context in vv. 10-11. It clearly denotes some kind of action against encroaching nations. The psalmist, strengthened by reliance on God *(bᵉšēm yhwh),* turns to face the enemy.

m. *nwn.* In a description of a "righteous king's" reign, which influences the whole fertile earth (Ps. 72:16-17), we find a prayer wishing him well: "May his name *(šᵉmô)* endure forever." There are cosmic dimensions: "May his name *(šᵉmô)* spread abroad *(yinnôn)* before the sun." The point is not that a king's name will endure for a long time or thrive like a luxuriant plant. Here *šēm* stands for the king himself. The generalized formulation allows the text to be applied to different kings.

n. *nḥl.* In describing the distribution of the land, Nu. 26:55 states that the land is to be apportioned by lot, according to the individual names *(lišmôṯ)* of the ancestors, and distributed in hereditary portions. The *šēmôṯ* are associated with entitlements possessed by their original bearers.

o. *nśʾ.* The names of the twelve tribes of Israel are engraved on gems; Aaron bears these names before Yahweh (Ex. 28:12,19). The psalmist praises Yahweh with enthusiasm: "I will lift up my hands and call on your name" (Ps. 63:5[4]). Another psalmist will associate only with those who believe in Yahweh. He sees the suffering of those worship other gods. He will not make offerings to them, and above all refuses to take their names on his lips (16:4). The deities themselves are present in their names — not least in the proximity established by offerings, which keep the gods alive.

The expression *nśʾ ʾeṯ-šēm yhwh/šᵉmô laššāwʾ* occurs twice in both Ex. 20:7 and Dt. 5:11; they have been, and still are, the subject of much debate. The word *šāwʾ* provides the interpretive key: the name of God is used deceptively.[26] The *šēm* points to Yahweh,

---

26. See F. V. Reiterer, "Die Bedeutsamkeit von 54, Stil und Paralleltermini zur Erfassung des Inhaltes von *šaw*," in Reiterer, ed., *Liebe zum Wort. FS L. Bernhard* (Salzburg, 1993), 173-213.

who is present in his name. Using his name *laššāw'* strips it of its divine potency. All that is left is a trivial, worthless, unreliable name.

p. *ntn.* To the eunuchs who keep the Sabbath and observe the *tôrâ,* Yahweh will give *yāḏ* ("influence") and *šēm* ("importance") in society, more than children would give (as representatives in the legal community) (Isa. 56:5a). The words that follow, "I will give them a *šēm 'ôlām*" (v. 5b), appear to convey a different nuance, referring to the fame deriving from the influence and importance just mentioned. Zeph. 3:19 also refers to people with physical handicaps (the lame). Yahweh will bring them back home and make them renown *(leššēm)* — as the par. *liṯhillâ,* "into praise," indicates — among all the peoples of the earth. When God threatens reprisals against the priests who fail to give glory to his name, we see that in the *šēm* it is actually God who is at issue (Mal. 2:2). Turning the priests' blessings into curses makes vividly clear the drama of such misconduct (cf. the positive variant in Ps. 115:1).

q. *'śh.* It was Yahweh himself, not a messenger or angel, who saved his people (Isa. 63:8-9). After they rebelled, they remembered how Yahweh had led Moses into order to make *(la'aśôṯ)* a reputation *(šēm)* for himself (v. 12). This is even clearer in v. 14, where *tip'āreṯ* is added to *šēm* as *nomen rectum.*

After the people agree to keep Yahweh's commandments, we hear Moses' desire that Yahweh will therefore make Israel the highest of all the nations he has made in praise and fame *(lešēm)* and honor. In the sense of "fame," *šēm* fits seamlessly into the list (Dt. 26:19). With the mighty deliverance of Israel from Egypt, Yahweh made for himself a name that lasts to this day (Neh. 9:15). These late words speak of the fame that God gained (cf. Jer. 32:20 and Dnl. 9:15).

The people's resolve to build a tower is based on the wish "to make a name for themselves" (Gen. 11:4). The focus is not so much on esteem as on power, for it can be blocked by the scattering of the people.

Facing the danger of destruction by the Canaanites, Joshua turns to Yahweh. The name of the Israelites is in grave danger, and therefore also that of the God who supports them. Hence Joshua's question: "What will you do for your great name?" The "great name" probably refers also to the esteem Yahweh came to enjoy for his mighty acts of deliverance, but above all to the potency evinced in these acts, the power of Yahweh.

In Nathan's prophecy Yahweh says that he took David from the pasture and has been with him ever since, cutting off all his enemies. David is also told (in the perfect tense, referring to a completed action) that Yahweh made him a *šēm gāḏôl* like that of the great nations (1 S. 7:9; 1 Ch. 17:8). It is the power of these nations that distinguished them and made them famous. The same is granted to David. This meaning is clearly expressed by the lapidary formulation of 2 S. 8:13: *wayya'aś dāwiḏ šēm.* The usual reflexive translation ("David made a name for himself"; cf. NRSV) has no grammatical basis in the text: "David made a *šēm.*" How is this *šēm* realized? The context speaks of conquered nations and plunder, including articles of precious metal, which David dedicated to Yahweh. David made power *(šēm),* he expanded power.

The people, living under constant threat, realize that they have gone astray; they cannot simply assume that God will intervene to protect the innocent. So the author ar-

gues a different motivation: "Act, O Yahweh, for your name's sake" (Jer. 14:7). This expression functions as a circumlocution for a reflexive: "Act for your own sake" — with the implication that Yahweh himself is present "in the name."

This coalescence of the spoken name and the presence of God is illustrated by the passages where Yahweh acts in his own name to prevent the *šēm* from being profaned in the sight of the nations. This is why Yahweh delivered Israel from Egypt (Ezk. 20:14; cf. vv. 9,22). When Yahweh saves his people in spite of their reprehensible deeds, he does so for the sake of his name, so that the people will know: *ʾănî yhwh* (v. 44; cf. Ps. 109:21). The self-presentation formula is placed substantially on the same plane as "acting for the sake of his own name."

r. *qdš*. Ezekiel sees the profanation of the holy name (Ezk. 36:21). For his own sake (v. 22), Yahweh takes action, sanctifying the great name (v. 23; the perfect tense expresses certainty). If *šēm* and Yahweh are not totally identical, *šēm* is at least a possible variant term.

A description of the age of well-being, associated redactionally with Isaiah (Isa. 29:17-24), cites arguments for Yahweh's deliverance. Just as Yahweh redeemed Abraham in the past, so he will redeem Jacob in the present. When the people see these acts, they will "sanctify my name" *(yaqdîšû šᵉmî)*. That *šᵉmî* actually refers to God is shown by what follows: they will sanctify the Holy One of Israel and stand in awe of the God of Israel. Every argument turns on the knowledge of God.

s. *qnʾ*. In Yahweh's promise to restore Israel's fortunes,[27] two grounds are cited: Yahweh has mercy on Israel, and he was very jealous *(qinnēʾṯî)* for his holy name (Ezk. 39:25). The holy name is contrasted antithetically with the house of Israel. In Ezekiel's usage Yahweh delivers Israel for the sake of his own holiness; *šēm* serves here as a variant of the divine name or as another term for the Holy One.

t. *rʾh*. The gloss *wᵉṯûšîyâ yirʾeh šᵉmeḵā* in Mic. 6:9 is extremely intrusive. Syntactically, *tûšîyâ* is probably a verbless clause of a single element ("deliverance [is at hand]"); it is followed by a verbal clause: "if one sees my name." Following v. 9, Yahweh demands attention and makes several accusations, primarily having to do with the economic system. The gloss, influenced by v. 8, points out the way to escape the ineluctable consequences. If the people will look on "your name" *(šᵉmeḵā)*, viz. "on you, on God," deliverance will dawn.

u. *śgb*. Isa. 12, a late text, speaks of giving thanks for the coming of salvation: on that day people will be summoned to thank Yahweh, to call on his name, etc. In short: "His name [= God] is exalted *(niśgāḇ)*" (v. 4; cf. Ps. 148:13). In Ps. 20:2(1) God's answer in the day of trouble is possible because the name of the God of Jacob "protects you *(yᵉśaggeḇᵉḵā)*."

v. *šlḥ*. Despite the constraints of the acrostic form, Ps. 25 is structured. V. 11, with the central petition of the psalm, serves as the midpoint.[28] The worshipers are aware of their guilt (v. 11b), but are certain that Yahweh will pardon them for his name's sake.

---

27. → שבות *šᵉḇûṯ*.
28. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I*, 165.

The point is the content implicit in the name: with Yahweh are associated salvation and deliverance. Also appropriate to the context is the meaning in which *šēm* refers to its bearer — "for his own sake."

w. *šmʿ*. The queen of Sheba had heard of Solomon's fame (1 K. 10:1); the text awkwardly adds *lᵉšēm yhwh*. The LXX and Syr. change *l* to *w*, solving the syntactic problem. The subject matter remains the same: in what follows, the focus is exclusively on Solomon. The addition is probably a gloss indicating that Solomon's fame also brings fame *(lᵉšēm)* to Yahweh. In 1 K. 8:41 foreigners come from distant lands to worship Yahweh in the temple, because they hear *(yišmᵉʿûn)* of the great power demonstrated in the deliverance of Israel by Yahweh's mighty hand and outstretched arm.

Reiterer

10. *With lᵉmaʿan*. The prepositional phrase *lᵉmaʿan šēm* (always referring to Yahweh) is polysemic. When Ezk. 20:9 says that God acted *(ʿāśâ)* for the sake of his name to deliver his people, it means restoring the holiness of that name, which was being profaned (*ḥll* hiphil) among the nations; but overtones of "reputation, esteem" are also present (as in vv. 14 and 22). We may compare Nu. 14:23ff., which argues similarly and is clearly concerned with God's reputation — although here the phrase *lᵉmaʿan šēm* does not occur. God's reputation appears also to be at issue when Jeremiah prays (Jer. 14:21) that Yahweh will not spurn *(nʾṣ)*[29] his people for his name's sake, lest the throne of his glory be dishonored. In a similar vein Ps. 106:8 says that Yahweh saved Israel for his name's sake, in order to make known (*ydʿ* hiphil) his mighty power *(gᵉḇûrâ)*. Ps. 79:9 points in the same direction. Here the worshipers pray for forgiveness and help "for your name's sake" (in parallel with *ʿal-dᵉḇar šēm*); the verse refers to the *kāḇôḏ* of the name, and the following verse declares that the nations should not ask sarcastically, "Where is their God?"

In other cases *šēm* is associated with the nature and attributes of God. In Ps. 143:11 the psalmist prays that Yahweh will help him "for his name's sake," in parallel with "for the sake of your righteousness" — i.e., Yahweh's actions should be true to his nature and his promises. It is also possible to take *šēm* as "representing the personality"[30] and paraphrase: "because you are who you are." Similarly, Ps. 109:21 prays for help "for your name's sake" with reference to Yahweh's *ḥeseḏ*. Ps. 23:3 probably also falls into this category: the divine shepherd leads in right paths "for his name's sake." According to 1 S. 12:22, Yahweh will not cast away *(nṭš)* his people "for his great name's sake" (here *baʿᵃḇûr*), because he has made them his own people: he has, as it were, placed himself under an obligation that he must fulfill. When Jer. 14:7 prays for forgiveness "for your name's sake," the motivation appears to be an appeal to God's mercy and compassion.

A totally different intention appears in 1 K. 8:41 and Isa. 66:5. In the first passage

---

29. See III.2.a.(11) above.
30. Van der Woude, 1351.

foreign nations come to Jerusalem "on account of your name," i.e., in order to worship Yahweh; in the latter, the Israelites addressed are rejected by their own people because they have confessed their faith in Yahweh ("on account of my name").

Ringgren

IV. 1. *LXX.* The usual word used by the LXX to translate *šēm* is *ónoma.* We also find *kaleín* (Prov. 21:24), *kaúchēma* (Dt. 26:19), *lálēma* (Ezk. 23:10), *onomastós* (Gen. 6:4; Nu. 16:2; Dt. 26:19; 2 S. 7:9; 1 K. 4:31; 1 Ch. 5:24; 11:20; 12:31; Ezk. 22:5; Zeph. 3:19-20), *onomastí* (Est. 2:14), and *diá* (Est. 3:12; 8:10).

Reiterer

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The noun *šēm* occurs some 225 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Its distribution is broad, as is its semantic range. There are nevertheless significant concentrations in 1QM (41 occurrences, including 4QM), 11QT (21), CD (19, including 4Q), 1QH (16, including 4Q), and 4QDibHam (8, including 4Q504). Familiar OT expressions and meanings appear everywhere, but the themes addressed by particular scrolls give rise to certain preferences, as in 1QM, 1QH, 4QShirShab, and 11QT. The details are discussed below.

We find *šēm* almost exclusively in theological contexts. A more technical usage may be present in the inscriptions on the banners and shields described in the War Scroll: they bear the name of Israel (1QM 3:13; 5:1), the names of the twelve tribes (3:14; 5:1), the name(s) of the prince(s) or commanders (3:15-16; 5:1), or even the entire list of their names (*kwl prwš šmwtm,* 4:6-13). Since this list parallels the *'ᵉmeṯ, ṣeḏeq, kāḇôḏ,* etc., of God, it probably represents a variant form of homage to God.

Similar is the common expression *'anšê haššēm,* "famous, respected men" (1QM 2:6; 3:4; 1QSa 2:2,8,11,13; 4QM[f][496] 7:4), the precise meaning of which depends on the particular context: heads of families, the community council, those summoned to the assembly. Here we have one of the many self-designations used by members of the community; their rank in the hierarchy is defined more precisely in 1QSa.

This usage accords with the theology of divine calling associated with *šēm,* primarily in CD: the community calls itself "those called by name by God" (CD 2:11), who has established their names precisely (2:13); they are "called by name" (4:4), enlisted by name (14:3), and inscribed by their names (14:4-5). There is a detailed list of their names (4:5; cf. 1QM 12:2). Such a list is also mentioned in 4Q177(Catena[a]) 3:11 (= 4QMidrEschat[b] 10:11), which speaks of the number of the names *(mspr šmwt)* and of those who are set apart by their names. According to 1QM 12:2 there is a "book of the names" *(spr šnmwt);* in the fragmentary context it may parallel "the elect of the people." CD 20:20 speaks of a "book of remembrance" in which are entered all who think on God's name.

Because the community knows that it has been chosen by God, it blesses the name of God, who established the covenant "for their name" with their ancestors (1QM 13:7).

According to 4QDibHam[a](504), God has placed his name on the elect and pronounced it over them (4Q504 1-2 2:12; 4:4; cf. 4QM[a][491] 19:4). Undoubtedly we have here a transposition of the motif of God's name dwelling in Zion and Jerusalem, common in Dtn/Dtr theology (see esp. 11QT 3:4; 29:4; 45:12; 47:4,11; 52:16,20; 53:10; 56:5; 60:14; and the apocryphal psalm 4Q380 1 1:5). Such a pronouncement of a name as a token of election was addressed to the wicked priest, who had been called "by the name of truth" (*bšm 'mt,* 1QpHab 8:9) but proved to be unworthy of this call.

The uttered name of God is salvation (4Q381 24 7); it is God, rock, fortress, deliverer, Yahweh. The community accordingly pronounces this name at the break of day (1QS 10:13), thinks on it, praises it, extols it, loves it, exalts it, acclaims it, celebrates it, blesses it, invokes it, and brings offerings to it (1QM 14:4,8,12; 18:6; 1QH 1:30; 2:30; 3:23; 11:6,25; 12:3; 17:20; 1QH 4 17; 1QSb 4:28; 1Q34 3 1:6; 4Q491 8-9 1:10; 4Q502 8 5; 502 9 2; 502 98 4; 4Q504 1-2 3:4; 4:9; 6:15; 4Q508 1 2; 4Q511 35 6; 4Q512 2:1; CD 20:20; 11QPs[a]19[Plea] 6). This motif is especially common in the benedictions (4Q503 8:9; 15-16 3; 14 2); it led to the development of the distinctive blessing formula *brwk šmkh 'l yśr'l* (with minor variations), "Blessed be your name, O God of Israel" (1QM 18:6; 4Q491 8-9 1:6; 4Q503 14 2; 66 2; 4Q504 4 16; 4Q511 63 4:2; 4Q512 7:5). The holiness of the divine name is emphasized (1QpHab 2:4; 1QSb 5:28; 1QM 11:3; 4Q503 15-16 3; 41 4; 4Q504 1-2 6:15; 4 16; CD 20:34). Whoever forsakes the community dishonors the holiness of the name (1QpHab 2:4) and profanes it (CD 15:3). Conversely, whoever shows reverence to the holy is blessed (4Q503 14 4).

With the name of God are associated also the aspects of eternity (1QM 11:14; 4Q504 1-2 4:4; 5 1:3; 4Q508 1 2), greatness (1QM 11:2; 4Q505 129 1; cf. 8Q5 1 1), splendor (1QH 9:38; 4Q491 8-9 1:10; 4Q511 2 1:8), and joy (1QM 14:4; 4Q491 8-9 1:1; 4Q502 9 2; 4Q512 24-25 3). The commandment of exclusivity (Ex. 20:5; 34:14; Dt. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15) is also addressed in 11QT 2:12: *yhwh qn' šmw,* "Yahweh, the Jealous One is his name." His name must not be misused (1QS 6:27).

Whoever calls on the name of God is heard (11QPs[a] 19:6) and finds security in it (19:12). David's trust in God's great name paradigmatically called forth God's help against the Philistines (1QM 11:2-3; cf. 4Q508 1 2); such trust in God's name also brings deliverance to the present-day community (4Q381 15 9). Just as the prophet proclaims the word in God's name (11QT 61:3; cf. Dt. 18:20ff.), so the priest blesses in God's name (11QT 60:11). This latter usage becomes stereotyped in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, with a wealth of construct phrases. Here the individual angelic princes bless in the name of God's glory (4Q403 1 1:10,29; MasShirShab 2:24), God's majesty (4Q403 1 1:17,19; 4Q405 3 2:6), God's might (4Q403 1 1:21) and the might of the divine beings (4Q404 2 1; 4Q405 13 5), God's wonders (4Q405 13 3), and God's holiness (4Q403 1 1:23).

Fabry

שָׁמַד *šmd*

I. The Word: 1. Occurrences; 2. Distribution; 3. LXX; 4. Semantics; 5. Late Hebrew; 6. Cognate Languages. II. Contexts: 1. "Secular" and "Theological" Usage; 2. The "Sacral" in Secular Usage; 3. Actions and Consequences; 4. Cursing; 5. Banishment; 6. Dynastic Extermination; 7. Oracles against the Nations; 8. Deuteronomy and Dtr Literature; 9. *bāmôṯ;* 10. Apocalyptic; 11. Esther.

I. The Word.

1. *Occurrences.* The vb. *šmd* is attested 90 times in the Hebrew MT and once in the Aramaic MT. It occurs only in the hiphil (69 times) and — as passive equivalent — in the niphal (21 times). In Gen. 34:30 and Dt. 4:25, instead of the MT niphal, SP has a niphal II (= nithpael). The Aramaic occurrence in Dnl. 7:26 is a haphel. The PN **šemeḏ* in 1 Ch. 8:12 is textually dubious: the LXX and several mss. suggest that a *resh* has been misread as a *dalet.* The distribution of the occurrences between niphal and hiphil in the MT may be a product of Proto-Masoretic or Masoretic standardization in Deuteronomy. If so, an earlier stage of the text would have exhibited 76 occurrences of the hiphil and 14 of the niphal.

Several passages present textual problems. The reading *w'śygm* in Ps. 18:38(Eng. 37) is probably original, rather than *w'šmydm* in 2 S. 22:38, since *nśg* is more appropriate to the enumerative series of verbs. The text in Samuel has possibly been "deuteronomized" — albeit at a very late date, for David swore an oath not to inflict *šmd* on the family of his archenemy Saul (1 S. 24:22-23[21-22]). The absence of an equivalent to *wyšmd* in the LXX text of 1 K. 16:14 is due to an extensive homoioteleuton.

In Ezk. 34:16 the MT and Tg. *(šmd)* are at odds with all other textual witnesses *(šmr).* The conflict probably arises from a confusion between *resh* and *dalet* in the Hebrew text; the question is, which was the original reading? There is a contextual relationship with an LXX variant in v. 4. MT *šmd* is probably the original reading; at the end of the section promising salvation (vv. 11-16), this sudden alarm leads to the section threatening judgment (vv. 17-22).[1]

In Ps. 37:28 scholars (following Cappellus, who suspected that a stich had been left

---

šmd. M. L. Barré, "Amos 1:11 Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 420-27; A. F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings. CBQMS* 17 (1986); W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. FRLANT* 108 (1972); W. T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative. JSOTSup* 93 (1990); N. Lohfink, "Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," in J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt, eds., *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 87-100; idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur. SBAB* 12 (1991), 125-42; idem, "Die Stimmen in Dtn 2," *BZ* 37 (1993) 209-35; D. Vetter, "שָׁמַד *šmd* hi. to exterminate," *TLOT,* III, 1367-68.

1. For bibliog. see esp. P. Rembry, "Le thème du berser dans l'oeuvre de Ezéchiel," *SBFLA* 11 (1960/61) 113-44; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, III. OBO* 50/3 (1992), 280-82.

out) have conjecturally emended the *'ayin* strophe by restoring *'*awwālîm* after *ḥ^asîdāyw.*[2] This emendation is based on a double translation in the LXX and the possible corruption of *'*wlym* to *l'wlm,* or a haplography of the two very similar words. If we then assume that *nišmārû* represents a *dalet-resh* misreading of **nišmāḏû,* the result is a smooth beginning of the *'ayin* strophe, comparable to v. 38: *'awwālîm l^e'ôlām nišmāḏû.* According to Allegro,[3] 4QpPs^a 4:1 even reads the lemma as *nšmdw.* The following commentary ("they are the violent ones") may support this reading, even though the length of the line makes unlikely Allegro's proposed restoration of *'wlym* (based on LXX) to fill the lacuna.[4] This emendation is not included in the statistical summary above.

There is no reason to suspect the occurrences of *šmd* in Est. 8:11, since the versions of the book of Esther that lack an equivalent represent independent recensions.

As to niphal/hiphil variation,[5] the SP and in many cases the LXX have readings that suggest an original hiphil in Dt. 7:23; 12:30; 28:20,24,45,51,61, where the MT has a niphal. Textual criticism faces a difficult question here. On the one hand, the LXX displays a late tendency to specify the logical subjects of actions left unspecified by the niphal. On the other hand, except in passages where the consonantal text does not permit the change, the MT appears to have eliminated the unusual form *hašmîḏ* (hiphil inf. const.) by vocalizing it as a niphal. The combination of *'aḏ* + *hiššāmeḏ^ekā* (which looks like a stereotyped formula) appears originally to have been less firmly associated with the niphal than it seems, especially on the basis of Dt. 28 (MT); cf. the MT of Dt. 7:24; 28:48; Josh. 11:4; 23:15; 1 K. 15:29; 2 K. 10:17. This operation was limited to Deuteronomy.

In Josh. 11:20 the LXX has a passive instead of the hiphil of the MT; this is probably an example of free translation, as in the case of the preceding *hḥrymm,* translated by the same word, because the context does not make clear whether Yahweh or Israel is the logical subject of the actions. In 2 S. 21:5, too, we are probably dealing with free translation.

2. *Distribution.* The occurrences of *šmd* are concentrated in Deuteronomy, where it appears 29 times, so that 5% of the OT corpus accounts for 32% of the occurrences of the root. The niphal appears 9 times in Deuteronomy (43% of all occurrences of the niphal) and the hiphil 20 times (29% of all occurrences of the hiphil). For the hiphil this concentration extends to the entire DtrH: it appears 37 times in Deuteronomy — 2 Kings (54% of all occurrences of the hiphil). The 5 occurrences of the hiphil in Esther are also noteworthy: this book, which amounts to about 1% of the biblical text, accounts for 7% of all occurrences of the hiphil. Thus the occurrences of the root are even more concentrated in Esther than in Deuteronomy.

---

2. See *BHS.*
3. Contra M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim. CBQMS* 8 (1979), 220.
4. J. Strugnell, *RevQ* 7 (1969/71) 216; D. Pardee, *RevQ* 8 (1972/75) 187.
5. See esp. C. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium. HKAT* I/3.1 (^{2}1923), in loc.

3. *LXX.* Before we examine the usage and meaning of the word, it is worth looking at the LXX. It understood the word as meaning "destroy," but was unable to find a single exclusive Greek equivalent. Most frequently (34 times) it uses *exolethreúein,* "annihilate," but this word more often translates *krt, ḥrm,* and *yrš.* Next come *apollýnai* (together with *apṓleia*), "destroy," which serves primarily to translate *'bd, aphanízein* (together with *aphanismós*), "cause to vanish," most often used to translate *šmm,* and *exaíprein,* "remove, scatter, eradicate," which more often translates *ns'* and *yrš.* Only *ektríbein/syntríbein,* "rub out, exterminate," selected 10 times, is used primarily to translate *šmd.* This observation suggests the possibility that the core meaning of *šmd* does not have a lexemic equivalent in Greek.

At first, the translator of Deuteronomy usually adopted the translation used for the first occurrence of *šmd* in the Pentateuch (Gen. 34:30: *ektríbein*), but from Dt. 6:15 on it made almost exclusive use of *exolethreúein.* The latter is also the usual translation in the Psalter. The book of Isaiah and the oracles against the nations prefer *apollýnai,* so that it becomes the commonest translation in the prophetic books.

4. *Semantics.* Clearly *šmd* almost always denotes an act of destruction; the dictionaries therefore give its meaning as "destroy, annihilate." Certain observations, however, support a more abstract meaning, which need not necessarily imply "annihilation" — something more like "remove." This meaning might also have been linked to a specific concrete complex of ideas, the family — ancestors — inheritance nexus. If so, the root *šmd* would originally have denoted what happens when this nexus is broken. Naturally the meaning could be flattened to the less specific "kill, destroy" in many passages (e.g., in Jgs. 21:16, where only women are the victims of the action). At the same time, the word can easily convey overtones of the Dtr destruction of non-Israelites. In the book of Esther we note the stereotyped series of verbs referring to the planned pogrom against the Jews (*šmd — hrg — 'db,* Est. 3:13; 7:4; 8:11).

a. *Lexical Field.* The various contexts, as well as parallel and antithetical statements, clearly place *šmd* in the lexical field of killing and destruction.

The root appears in the Dtr context of annihilating the indigenous nations during Israel's occupation of Canaan, but it also appears in Deuteronomy, even more frequently in the curses threatened upon Israel. In the books of Kings it also stands for the eradication of dynasties. In the prophetic oracles against the nations it is used in statements about the destruction of cities and populations.

The sapiential Ps. 37 uses the niphal of *šmd* in v. 38; shortly before, v. 36 says of the wicked: *wayya'ᵃḇōr wᵉhinnēh 'ênennû wā'ᵃḇaqšēhû wᵉlō' nimṣā'.* This is almost a definition: when the action denoted by *šmd* has taken place, nothing is left. This can even apply to a "name," as another quasi-definition shows: *'emḥeh 'eṯ-šᵉmām mittaḥaṯ haššāmayim* (Dt. 9:14; cf. 2 S. 14:7 and Isa. 14:22, where *šēm* stands alongside *šᵉ'ērîṯ* and *šᵉ'ār*).

Although *šmd* does not occur in Dt. 2–3, the narrative of the destruction of the kingdoms of Sihon and Og, its occurrences in 31:4 summarizes the events. When *šmd* appears in a series of verbs having the same object, it usually comes last (27 instances), thus denoting the bitter end of the whole chain of events or summarizing it. The con-

cluding expression *'aḏ* + infinitive of *šmd* is typical (12 times: Dt. 7:23,24; 28:20,24,45,48,51,61; Josh. 11:14; 23:15; 1 K. 15:29; 2 K. 10:17; cf. 1Q22 1:11). If the *bāmôṯ 'āwen* and their altars overgrown with thorns and thistles are the subjects quoted in Hos. 10:8b,[6] then having been struck by *šmd,* they can only utter the wish to sink back into the formless void of the cosmos: "They say to the mountains, Cover us, and to the hills, Fall on us."

It does not follow automatically, however, that *šmd* is strictly synonymous with the other words meaning "destroy." The verbs that appear with it in these series could also express sequential acts.

Most likely to be interchangeable with *šmd* is *krt:* Lev. 26:30; Dt. 12:30; 1 S. 24:22(21); 1 K. 15:29 (cf. 14:10,14); Isa. 10:7; 14:23 (cf. v. 22); 48:19; Ezk. 14:9; 25:7; Mic. 5:13 (cf. vv. 9-12); Ps. 37:28,38 — 12 texts in all; the sequence of the two verbs is not fixed. In Dt. 4:3 and Ezk. 14:9, the comms. find transformations of the *krt* formula used in sacral law by P and H.[7] This category may also include the 8 passages where *šmd* is the consequence of sin, identified by the root *ḥṭ'* (Dt. 9:19; Josh. 7:12; 1 K. 13:34; 15:29; 16:12; 2 K. 10:17 [cf. 1 K. 21:21]; Isa. 13:9; Hos. 10:8; Am. 9:8; cf. 2 K. 10:28-29). The root *k's* also belongs here; it appears in several of these passages, 4 times in parallel with *šmd* (Dt. 4:26; 9:19; 1 K. 15:29; 16:12).

Most frequently, however, *šmd* occurs together with the root *'bd:* Nu. 33:52; Dt. 4:26; 7:23 (cf. v. 20); 7:24; 9:3; 28:20,24 (cf. v. 22),45(LXX),51,63; Josh. 23:15; Isa. 26:14; Jer. 48:8,42 (cf. v. 46); Ezk. 25:7; 32:12; Mic. 5:13 (cf. v. 9); Ps. 92:8(7) (cf. v. 10); Est. 3:13; 4:8; 7:4; 8:11; Dnl. 7:26 (Aramaic) — a total of 23 times. In 8 cases *yrš* is found nearby: Dt. 2:12,21,22; 7:23,24; 9:3; Josh. 24:8; Am. 2:9 — possibly all Dtr. The context mentions "wrath" *('ap)* 8 times: Dt. 6:15; 7:4; 9:19; Josh. 23:15; Isa. 13:9; Mic. 5:13; Lam. 3:66). Six times the text says that the last "remnant" has been destroyed or that no "remnant" was left: Josh. 11:14; 2 S. 14:7; 1 K. 15:29; 16:11-12; 2 K. 10:17; Isa. 14:22-23. There are 5 occurrences of *hrg* (Gen. 34:30; 2 S. 14:7; Est. 3:13; 7:4; 8:11) and of *ḥrm* (Josh. 7:12; 11:14,20; Dnl. 11:44; 2 Ch. 20:23 — surprisingly, none in Deuteronomy), 4 of *nkh* (1 K. 15:29; 16:12; 2 K. 10:17,28) and of *šḥt* (Dt. 9:25-26; 2 S. 14:11; Ps. 106:23; 2 Ch. 20:23),[8] and 3 of *nṭh yāḏ* (Isa. 23:11; Ezk. 14:9; 25:7), of *npl* (2 S. 22:38; Ezk. 32:12; Ps. 106:23), of *ntn bᵉyaḏ* (Dt. 1:27; 7:23,24), and of *rdp* (Dt. 28:45; 2 S. 22:38; Lam. 3:66).[9] The other words, occurring only once or twice in the company of *šmd,* also belong to the vocabulary of destruction, often with nuances of military or curse terminology: *'sp* niphal *'al, 'sr, 'ēš, grš, hwm, hpk, hrs, ḥbl, yrd, kḥd, klh, kll, kn', lkd, mḥh, mḥṣ, mwt, ngp, nhg, nšl, ntn lᵉḇaz* (cj.), *ntn lip̄nê, ntṣ, ntš, swr, 'kr, pwṣ, pqd, prd, śwm lᵉmôṣā'ôṯ (Q)/lᵉmaḥᵃrā'ôṯ (K), śwm lᵉšammâ, śrp, šdd, šlḥ yāḏ,* and *tpś.* Dt. 28:24,48,51,61 may show what precedes *šmd* and what its results are.

Antithetical statements point in the same direction: Gen. 35:5 (following 34:30), *lō'*

6. See *RHB,* V, 197.
7. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 302-4; Vetter, 1368.
8. See Barré, 426.
9. See Barré, 423-24.

rāḏ^e^pû 'aḥ^a^rê b^e^nê ya'^a^qōḇ; Dt. 4:4, *ḥayyîm kull^e^ḵem hayyôm;* 4:26, *lō'-ṯa'^a^rîḵûn yāmîm 'al* [*hā'āreṣ*]; 7:24, *lō'-yiṯyaṣṣēḇ 'îš b^e^pāneyḵā* (cf. also 2 S. 21:5); 28:47 (with v. 48), serve Yahweh your God *b^e^śimḥâ ûḇ^e^ṭûḇ lēḇāḇ;* 28:63, Yahweh takes delight *l^e^hêṭîḇ 'eṯkem ûl^e^harbôṯ 'eṯkem* (numerous offspring: see also Isa. 48:19); Josh. 9:24, saving life *(nep̄eš);* 11:20, receiving mercy *(t^e^ḥinnâ).*

According to Isa. 26:14, the resurrection of the dead to new life is inconceivable when God has carried out *šmd.* In Ezk. 34:16 *šmd* appears to represent the opposite of all the care a shepherd lavishes on his flock. The antithesis to the destruction of the nations that come against Jerusalem (Zec. 12:9) is the outpouring of the spirit of compassion and supplication in the city (v. 10). The opposite of the transgressor whom *šmd* awaits (Ps. 37:38) is the upright, who is promised *'aḥ^a^rîṯ* (posterity?), salvation, refuge, and help (vv. 37-40; cf. also vv. 27-29, as well as Ps. 145:20 [*šmr*] and Prov. 14:11 [*prḥ*]). Ps. 92:8(7) focuses its attention initially on the flourishing prosperity of the wicked; then comes the reversal that leads to *šmd.* In many of these passages *šmd* belongs to the associational domain of cursing, while its opposite belongs to the domain of blessing. The sequence associated with the curse is stated in Dt. 28:20: *šmd* is the final phase of *hamm^e'^ērâ, hamm^e^hûmâ,* and *hammiḡ'ereṯ.*

In Isa. 10:6 God commands Assyria *lišlōl šālāl w^e^lāḇōz baz ûl^e^śûmô* [*Q*] *mirmās k^e^ḥōmer ḥûṣôṯ.* The statement with *šmd* that follows in v. 7 is not antithetical but climactic. This passage, too, illustrates once again the radically negative element conveyed by *šmd.*

b. *Victims.* When we turn to the objects of the vb. *šmd,* we find that they are more restricted than in the case of other words that mean "destroy." In English, "destruction" is not limited specifically to human beings. The victims of *šmd,* however, are almost always human beings — not animals, plants, or physical objects. Animals and plants appear only as metaphors for humans (sheep, Ezk. 34:16; a tree, Am. 2:9; in both cases the verb is probably not part of the metaphor). In 2 K. 10:28 the god Baal is likewise viewed metaphorically as an inhabitant of Samaria, if not its ruler. In Jer. 48:8 *hammîšôr* stands for its inhabitants; the "house" in Prov. 14:11 means primarily the family. The "name" in 1 S. 24:22(21); Isa. 14:23; 48:19 is a personal reality in the context of society.

There remain only these marginal examples: (1) three passages with *bāmôṯ* (Lev. 26:30; Nu. 33:52; Hos. 10:8); (2) the fortresses of Isa. 23:11 (reading *mā'uzzeyhā*)[10] and the clearly fortified cities of Mic. 5:13(14) (par. to *'^a^šêreyḵā*); and (3) the obscure *ḥōzeq maml^e^ḵôṯ haggôyim* of Hag. 2:22. In Isa. 23:11 and Mic. 5:13(14) the fortresses and cities may be personified; the *bāmôṯ* are discussed elsewhere.[11] Thus *šmd* appears to denote an action that can be carried out only against human beings, even if it is not limited to the physical body.

In Josh. 7:12 the object of *šmd* hiphil is *ḥērem.* The parallel clause in v. 13 has *swr* hiphil + *ḥērem.* Does *ḥērem* here refer to the booty misappropriated by Achan, which

---

10. See most recently S. Talmon, *Textus* 4 (1969) 124.

11. See II.9 below.

undoubtedly belonged to the *ḥērem* from Jericho (cf. 6:17-19; 7:1,11)? This interpretation is not entirely certain, if only because the account in 7:24-25 of how God's command in 7:12 was carried out, although it says that the misappropriated items were brought to the Valley of Achor, goes on to describe the stoning of Achan and his family. Whether the *ḥērem* booty was burned and buried with Achan under the heap of stones or found its way into the treasury of Yahweh (cf. the original instructions in 6:19) remains an open question. Furthermore, the preceding extensive oracle scene focuses all its attention on discovering the guilty party, not on the misappropriated articles. Even before 7:12b, the referent of the word *ḥērem* is reversed in 7:11,12a: "[The Israelites] . . . have taken some of the *ḥērem*. . . . They have become *ḥērem*." The real object of *šmd* in 7:12 is thus the persons, not the items they misappropriated.

c. *Abstract Sense.* Concretely, the action denoted by *šmd* is almost always physical destruction. Some exceptions, however, suggest a more abstract sense, which admits still other possibilities.

In 8 passages a statement using *šmd* is joined by a statement about a "remnant." In this series statements about a final "remnant" that falls victim to *šmd* are of no semantic interest (2 S. 14:7; 2 K. 10:17; Isa. 14:22-23). Statements that no remnant was left after the action of *šmd* are semantically ambiguous: they might represent either synonymous or synthetic parallelism (Josh. 11:14; 2 S. 14:7; 1 K. 15:29; 16:11-12). Dt. 4:26-27 and 28:61-63 (cf. also vv. 64-68), on the other hand, speak of the fate of the remnant left after *šmd*. In both texts the reference is to the Israelites taken into exile. In the preceding statement using *šmd*, if we do not posit the rhetorical figure of hyperbole, the meaning of *šmd* is so abstract that it can include not just destruction but also dispossession and banishment.

In Isa. 10:22-23 a "remnant" of Israel continues to play an historical role even after Assyria has carried out its intention to *šmd* "nations not a few" (v. 7) — certainly including Israel. If we interpret this use of *šmd* in the light of vv. 8 and 13-14, it refers to replacement of the indigenous monarchy with Assyrian officials, redrawing of borders, plundering of wealth, and possibly deportation of populations. Nothing is said about a total eradication of the nations in question; such an interpretation would also be historically improbable.

It is inappropriate to cite Am. 9:8 in this context. This notion might arise if one assumes that *mamlāḵâ haḥaṭṭā'â* and *bêṯ ya'ᵃqōḇ* are identical. But then the global threat of *šmd* would be corrected by the following emphatically negated statement, also using *šmd*, which limits the destruction to the sinners (cf. the metaphor of the sieve in the next verse). But the presumed identity of the two terms is probably questionable.[12]

In the fictive story — to be discussed in more detail later[13] — that the wise woman of Tekoa tells David in 2 S. 14 at the behest of Joab, the family clearly seeks the death of the fratricide, but certainly not that of his mother (vv. 7,11). In v. 16, nevertheless, at the rhetorical climax of the dialogue, the mother stresses that the avenger of blood in-

12. See I.4.d below.
13. See I.4.d below.

tends *l^ehašmîḏ 'ōṯî w^e'eṯ-b^enî yaḥaḏ minnaḥ^alaṯ '^elōhîm*. For the son this means death, but for his widowed mother it clearly means only exclusion from the nexus of family and inheritance that will result from the death of her only surviving son. Here *šmd* denotes the legally unimpeachable removal of a person from this nexus. Its meaning must be sufficiently abstract to admit this possibility.

In 2 S. 21:5 the Gibeonites describe Saul as the man who planned that his act of *šmd* inflicted on them would be so extreme that *mēhiṯyaṣṣēḇ b^eḵol-g^eḇul yiśrā'ēl,* "we should have no place in all the territory of Israel." Clearly this passage does not envision total annihilation. That possibility could have been stated more directly. There were still Gibeonites at the time recounted — indeed, there still are Gibeonites, and they are talking to David. The text must therefore refer to something other than total, irreversible slaughter. This also suggests a more abstract sense of *šmd,* which appears to be connected with the relationship of a population group to the land.

In Dt. 33:27 we find the parallelism *grš . . . šmd.* The subject of *grš* is God; the subject of *šmd* is Israel. The parallelism may nevertheless be synonymous. If so, the sense of *šmd* would again have to be sufficiently abstract to include the meaning of *grš* as a possibility.

d. *The Family-Ancestors-Inheritance Nexus.* The conclusion that *šmd* has a more abstract meaning than simply "destroy" remains unsatisfactory until we can also point to a more concrete semantic core. In the discussion that follows, therefore, we shall present a new hypothesis concerning the original meaning of *šmd,* taking 2 S. 14 as our point of departure.

The fictive story of the wise woman of Tekoa is clearly pre-Dtr. It derives its rhetorical impact from the profound belief, shared by all those involved (including David), in a reality that concerns the intimate relationship of family (*bêṯ 'āḇ,* v. 9), inheritance *(naḥ^alâ),* ancestors venerated by funerary monuments and in the cult of the dead (divinized in v. 16 as *naḥ^alaṯ '^elōhîm*[14]), sons to inherit (v. 7), and the future of the "name" (v. 7) (the "family-ancestors-inheritance nexus"). In the story of the wise woman, the continuity of this nexus is endangered by the threatened killing of its only surviving personal representative. The same effect can be achieved in other circumstances by killing the entire family or banishing it from its hereditary home. The family-ancestors-inheritance nexus constantly threatens to break up, and this is where we find the root *šmd.* Of course this basic meaning can be extended to include an entire clan *(mišpāḥâ)* or even a whole nation. A particularly clear case is the extermination of a royal dynasty. When the act is extended to a people or nation, its continued existence as an entity is threatened (Jer. 48:42: *w^enišmaḏ mô'āḇ mē'ām,* "Moab shall cease to be a people").

This hypothesis explains not only the "abstract" sense required by certain texts, in contrast to the commonly assumed meaning "destroy," but also a series of individual observations that would otherwise be considered accidental.

The root often concerns not individuals but families, e.g., as the contexts show, in

14. T. J. Lewis, *JBL* 110 (1991) 597-612.

Gen. 34:30 (stated twice: *ʾanî meṯê mispār, ʾanî ûḇêṯî*); Josh. 7:12 (the house of Achan); 2 S. 21:5 (the Gibeonites); Ps. 37:28,38 (cf. the parallel verse); Prov. 14:11 ("house"). This holds true for the stereotyped appearance of *šmd* when royal houses are exterminated in the northern kingdom: 1 K. 13:34 and 15:29 (the house of Jeroboam); 16:12 (the house of Baasha); 2 K. 10:17 (the house of Ahab; cf. the anticipatory oracle in 1 K. 21:21-22). If the *mamlāḵâ haḥaṭṭāʾâ* in Am. 9:8 (not to be identified with the "house of Jacob") refers to the royal dynasty (the house of Jehu), this passage should also be included. The metaphor of Am. 2:9 also suggests the family with its several generations as a kind of intermediate metaphor: a tree with fruit above and roots beneath.

In 1 K. 13:34 *šmd* hiphil parallels *kḥd* hiphil. It is generally assumed that the latter word, whose primary meaning is "hide," also has a second, unrelated meaning "destroy." Possibly, however, in the passages in question it simply means entrance into the realm of invisible obscurity that results when the family-ancestors-inheritance nexus is dissolved.

In 1 K. 15:29 the suffix on *ʿaḏ-hišmiḏô* probably refers to Jeroboam as a collective personality (= the house of Jeroboam).

The dissolution of ties with hereditary land (*minnaḥalaṯ ʾelōhîm,* 2 S. 14:16) that is one aspect of *šmd* is expressed by the frequent addition of *mēʿal penê hāʾaḏāmâ* (Dt. 6:15; 28:63; 1 K. 13:34; Am. 9:8; cf. also Dt. 4:26 [exile]; Josh. 23:15 [*mēʿal hāʾaḏāmâ haṭṭôḇâ hazzōʾṯ*]; 2 S. 21:5 [*mēhiṯyaṣṣēḇ bekol-geḇul yiśrāʾēl*]; Isa. 13:9 [*hāʾāreṣ . . . mimmennâ*]; 1QS 5:19 [*mtbl*]; 4Q381 69 3 [*mʿlyh* = from the land]).

The ethnographic comments of the narrator in Dt. 2:12,21,22,23[15] state formulaically that the new group inflicted *šmd* on the former inhabitants *(yāšeḇû . . . lepānîm)* and then settled in their place *(wayyēšeḇû taḥtām),* thus establishing firm ties with the territory.

A further element of the family-ancestors-inheritance nexus is the preservation of name and memory by offspring who continue to dwell on the ancestral portion. On "name" see Dt. 7:23-24; 9:14; 1 S. 24:22(21); 2 S. 14:7; Isa. 14:22-23; 48:19; on "seed" see 1 S. 24:22(21); Isa. 48:19; on "memory" see Isa. 26:14.

5. *Late Hebrew.* The Hebrew portions of Sirach have only one instance of *šmd* hiphil: 47:22 (B; fragmentary in this passage) states that, despite Solomon's stupidities, God did not put an end to his dynasty. The passage fits with other statements about the extermination of dynasties and presents itself as a reflection on the books of Kings.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šmd* occurs 15 times in the nonbiblical mss. published to date (and 4 additional occurrences in texts unpublished at the time of writing); 4QpPs[a] 4:18 should be excluded from these, because it is a lemma from Ps. 37:38. In proportion to the extent of the material, this is not much. Most occurrences, furthermore, involve allusions to or midrashic treatments of biblical texts: 4Q371 1 2; 4Q372 1 6, 22 (cf. Dt. 6); 4Q381 69 3 (cf. Dt. 2 and 9); 4QDibHam[a] 1-2 2:8 (cf. Dt. 9); 1Q22 1 11 (cf. Dt. 28); 5Q14 1 4 (cf. Dt. 28); 4QPs[a] 3:12 (cf. Ps. 37); 1QM 1:4 (cf. Dnl. 11). We may

---

15. Lohfink, "Stimmen."

also mention 4Q219 2 1:3 (cf. Jub. 22:22) in this context. On the basis of Daniel, *šmd* appears to have become an apocalyptic term (cf. also 1QM 9:5; 13:15). And in this context we find an instance of semantic development: in 1QH 14:16; 1QS 4:19; 5:19, *šmd* hiphil has practically become a term for the long-awaited eschatological destruction of all evil (or all the wicked) by God. The word marks the finality inherent in the separation of light from darkness. But such a meaning can also be found in Ps. 145:20.

In Middle Hebrew (and Jewish Aramaic) new stems make their appearance: piel, pual, and hithpael. An additional semantic element also enters the picture: defection from the law and from Judaism. If this represents a new development, a bridge may have been provided by the usage found in Ezekiel (e.g., Ezk. 14:9) or the semantic development reflected in Esther and the Dead Sea Scrolls. With regard to the latter, the eschatological separation of the people of God from all evil could have served — possibly in a deliberately evaluative and pejorative usage — to describe those who defected from the community.

6. *Cognate Languages.* Among the other Semitic languages, the root is attested only in Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaic, and possibly Nabatean. None of these provides any help for determining the meaning of the root in Biblical Hebrew. There is nothing to say about etymology.

II. Contexts.

1. *"Secular" and "Theological" Usage.* It is not always possible to determine whether the action of *šmd* is carried out by humans or by God. Determination of the grammatical subject is helpful only in part. In the case of the niphal, only the context can decide. But the context is not always clear, even in the case of many hiphil passages. Therefore many of the subjects listed in Lisowsky and the lexicons are open to debate.

Nevertheless, several textual domains exhibit a clear profile with respect to "secular" and "theological" usage. If we turn to DtrH — apart from Joshua, which in this context is associated more closely with Deuteronomy — there are at least 11 occurrences in Judges–2 Kings where the subject is human, versus at most 2 with God as subject (2 K. 21:9; possibly also 1 K. 13:34). The situation is similar in Esther. In narrative, therefore, the subject of *šmd* is generally human. In prayer the situation is reversed, as we see in the Psalter, where the only occurrence with a human subject is in Ps. 106:34.

In the prophetic books the situation is more complex, but usage can be categorized on the basis of literary form. The occurrences of *šmd* in the oracles against the nations always imply God's act of judgment, but the immediate agents of the action are creaturely, even in Isa. 13:9.[16] All other occurrences of *šmd* in the prophetic corpus are statements about God's action.

From our perspective Deuteronomy presents a mixed picture. Theological usage predominates (21 times to 5, with 3 ambiguous texts). But only the destruction of Israel

16. See below.

after the apostasy at Horeb, intended by God but averted by Moses, is associated exclusively with God (5 times). The *šmd* occurrences both in curses and in texts describing the destruction of earlier inhabitants of the land can involve both acts of God and human actions. This ambiguity continues to hold true for the destruction of the indigenous population in Joshua. Dt. 7:23-24 appears deliberately to combine the two aspects. The same is probably true of the narrative interpolations in 2:10-12,20-23. In Deuteronomy, therefore, we find a perspective that is fundamentally theological, while clearly drawing attention to the creaturely instruments employed when God acts. The oracles against the nations share this perspective with Deuteronomy; but in Deuteronomy the emphasis is on God, whereas in the oracles against the nations it is on the creaturely agents.

In Isa. 13:9 it is an open question whether Yahweh himself or the somewhat personified "day of Yahweh" is the grammatical subject. The concrete agents of destruction, however, are the *maml^ekôṯ gôyim* associated with the "day of Yahweh" in v. 4, who come from a distant land (v. 5).

This survey suggests that the theological usage of *šmd* is secondary to its "secular" usage. It does not follow, however, that the root underwent an evolutionary development leading to increasing dominance of theological discourse: the secular usage observed in the books of Kings vanishes in Chronicles, but in the same late period we find the totally nontheological usage of *šmd* in Esther.

2. *The "Sacral" in Secular Usage.* If the hypothesis outlined above concerning the original meaning of *šmd* is true, the root was never totally "secular." In particular, if we reckon with a sacral dimension of the ancestor cult (*naḥ^alaṯ ^*elōhîm*, 2 S. 14:16), the action denoted by *šmd* always includes a religious dimension. Something sacred, something divine, is destroyed when a family is wiped out and its inheritance placed at the disposal of others.

The sacral depths displayed in the fear of suffering *šmd* may account (at least in the narrative logic of the redactor) for Jacob's sudden departure from Shechem to go to Bethel following his words to Simeon and Levi in Gen. 34:30; the pericope includes renunciation of foreign gods, protective terror sent by God, and the building of an altar for the God of Bethel (Gen. 35:1-7). In Josh. 7:12 the action of *šmd* is forced by the negative sacrality of the *ḥērem*. Behind Jgs. 21:16 stands the problem that one of the twelve tribes faces the threat of being eliminated from the sacral entity of Israel (v. 17). In the history of the northern kingdom, at least at the level of the Dtr redaction, no dynasty is exterminated without prophetic approval: the destruction accords with God's governance of history. Even the appearance of *šmd* in the linguistic register of cursing is probably due to the fact that its semantic core borders directly on the sphere of the divine.

3. *Actions and Consequences.* Despite the paucity of occurrences (probably late) of *šmd* in statements concerning the association of actions and consequences or the principle of divine justice based on the law of talion, this usage may reflect an ancient topos (Prov. 14:11; Ps. 37:28,38; 92:8[7]; 145:20).

4. *Cursing*. The same is true for the use of the word in the language of cursing, as illustrated by the presumptive early stratum in Dt. 28 as well as Lam. 3:66.

5. *Banishment*. Less certain, I believe, is the antiquity of the use of the word to describe the banishment of an individual or a family from Israel. Here *šmd* in the language of Ezekiel may be a secondary intrusion upon a function normally played by *krt* (Ezk. 14:9; 34:16). It is true, however, that the word appears in this context as early as the story of Achan (Josh. 7:12). Since Ezk. 14:9 deals exclusively with God's action rather than human action, this usage may pave the way for the meaning of the intensive stems of the root, not attested until Middle Hebrew.

6. *Dynastic Extermination*. In the northern kingdom of Israel, in contrast to Judah, there was a succession of royal houses. In each case the last representative of a dynasty was killed by his successor. From the end of the Jehu dynasty on, the books of Kings describe only this event (1 K. 15:10,14,25,30 — so also in the earlier case of Zimri [1 K. 16:18-19]). For the three changes of dynasty from Jeroboam I to Jehu, however, the narrative recounts the extermination of the whole royal family, each time using the word *šmd:* 1 K. 15:29 (Baasha kills the house of Jeroboam), 1 K. 16:12 (Zimri kills the house of Baasha), 2 K. 10:17 (Jehu kills the house of Ahab [= the house of Omri]). Since the topos does not pervade the entire DtrH, the literary allocation of the texts is disputed. Noth[17] assigns them to various hands, Dietrich[18] ascribes them to his doubly secondary DtrP instead of the exilic DtrH, Campbell[19] sees in all but 1 K. 16:12 texts belonging to his pre-Dtr "prophetic record." Presumably this series also includes 2 K. 10:28, which says that Jehu wiped out Baal from Israel — for Campbell[20] the final sentence of his original "prophetic record."

The three texts that described the extermination of royal houses, although always naming human agents, are doubly theologized. First, each text states that the event was foretold by a prophet. All the prophecies appear in the immediately preceding text: 1 K. 14:10-11; 16:3-4; 21:21-22 (all without *šmd*). Second, in 1 K. 13:34 the narrator introduces a proleptic comment (using *šmd*) concerning Jeroboam, the first instance and in a sense exemplary. This assignment of this text is also disputed. The parallelism with *kḥd* in v. 34 and the sin of appointing priests indiscriminately in the associated v. 33 are not Dtr stereotypes. It is therefore at least not out of the question that the theologization of the extermination texts is pre-Dtr, and indeed that these texts never existed without a reference to an advance warning given by God.

In 1 K. 13:34; 15:30; 16:13; 21:22; 2 K. 10:29, the root *ḥṭ'* appears in immediate conjunction with *šmd* or with reference to a statement using it; in 1 K. 15:30; 16:13; 21:22, we also find the root *k's*. Since all these texts have to do with calf worship, there is an obvious terminological connection with the account of Israel's sin at Horeb in Dt.

17. *DH*, 110-11.
18. P. 88.
19. P. 91.
20. Ibid.

9, where the three roots *šmd*, *ḥṭ'*, and *k's* also appear together. The final canonical text presents a coherent discourse structure, but whether the diachronic priority is to be found in Dt. 9 or in this series of texts is hard to determine.

Two prophetic instances of *šmd* appear also to be associated with these extermination texts. Am. 9:8 has a series of elements in common with 1 K. 13:34, above all sin as motivation for the act of *šmd*. If the expression *mamlāḵâ haḥaṭṭā'â* refers to the reigning royal house of the northern kingdom,[21] we have here a prophet foretelling the extermination of the Jehu dynasty. It is even possible to suspect that one of the passages is dependent on the other, although the direction of the dependency can hardly be determined.

The prophetic oracle in Ezk. 34:16 uses the image of fat and strong sheep to describe not a dynasty but the group in power within the people of God, exploiting the others. Here, in contrast to all the other texts of this nature, God is the direct agent of the *šmd* act.

7. *Oracles against the Nations.* In oracles against the nations, *šmd* occurs in the following passages: Isa. 10:7 (Assyria against many nations); 13:9 (many unspecified nations against Babylon); 14:23 (Yahweh's "broom of destruction" against Babylon); 23:11 (oracle concerning Tyre: command to unspecified agents to destroy "Canaan's fortresses"); Jer. 48:8 ("the destroyer," probably Nebuchadnezzar, against the *mîšôr* of Moab); 48:42 (probably Nebuchadnezzar, "like an eagle" against Moab); Ezk. 25:7 (probably Nebuchadnezzar, against Ammon); 32:12 (the *gibbôrîm* of the king of Babylon, probably Nebuchadnezzar, against the *hāmôn*, "army" [or: "pride"[22]] of Egypt).

When Assyria set forth to *šmd*, it overstepped the charge it had from God (Isa. 10:7). If we ignore the disputed oracle concerning Tyre in Isa. 23, *šmd* as an action intended by God in the prophetic oracles against the nations always involves Nebuchadnezzar (Jeremiah and Ezekiel) and then the nations that are to destroy Babylon (Isa. 13:9; 14:23). Does it follow that *šmd* was not part of the original lexemic stock of these oracles but gained a foothold in the wake of Judah's experience with Nebuchadnezzar? But *šmd* is not used to describe the fall of Jerusalem under the Neo-Babylonians. If the nucleus of the oracle concerning Tyre in Isa. 23 is connected with the conquest of Tyre by Esarhaddon in 671 B.C.E.,[23] the observed concentration of the word is simply an accident of textual tradition. If so, the use of *šmd* in the oracles against the nations could have promoted the Dtr use of *šmd* for the destruction of indigenous nations by Israel during its entrance into Canaan.

8. *Deuteronomy and Dtr Literature.* All the uses of *šmd* discussed to this point could antedate Deuteronomy. In any case they account for the three most important contexts

---

21. As argued, e.g., by H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 348.
22. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 161.
23. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 418-19.

in which *šmd* appears in Deuteronomy: curse texts, Israel's sin at Horeb, and the destruction of indigenous nations during the occupation.

a. *Curse Texts.* In Dt. 28 *šmd* occurs 7 times, naturally only in the imprecatory sections: 6 instances of the infinitive following *'ad* (vv. 20,24,45,48,51,61) and once the finite verb with Yahweh as subject (v. 63).

In the MT a relatively late refinement of the text may have been undertaken to emphasize the word *šmd.* This "refinement" is quite extensive and is distinct from a different refinement in the LXX tradition. In Dt. 28 MT 10 constructions use *'aḏ* followed by an infinitive: 6 with *šmd,* 3 with *'bd,* 1 with *klh.* Dt. 28 contains in all 12 occurrences of these verbs of total destruction, clearly felt to be interchangeable. In the LXX there is no equivalent to *šmd* in v. 51 or to *'bd* in v. 63; in v. 24 the Hebrew prototype of the LXX may have had *'bd* instead of *šmd,* and v. 45 presupposes an additional *'aḏ ha'ᵃḇîḏᵉḵā.* This yields 10 *héōs* constructions, 5 with *'bd,* 4 with *šmd,* and 1 with *klh.* Here the SP follows the MT. It is therefore not certain that the LXX reflects an earlier form of the text than the MT. If it does, in a late period *šmd* became more important for the proto-MT tradition in Dt. 28. If it does not, the regular patterns observed suggest a late "refinement" of the text in the LXX as well, resulting in an evocative distribution of the verbs.

According to 2 K. 22–23, Josiah's law book included imprecatory texts; we must therefore envision a pre-Dtr textual stratum in Dt. 28. Its extent is disputed, but it may have included the instances of *šmd* in vv. 20 and 24, as well as (less likely) that in v. 45.

Dt. 28:20-24 must be viewed as a unit. V. 20 marks a new beginning, following a series of *'ārûr* constructions in vv. 16-19. Now Yahweh is the subject: actions of Yahweh are described verbally — he brings on illnesses and life-threatening natural phenomena. V. 25 introduces a new theme: enemies. In the relatively short unit so defined (vv. 20-24), the construction *'aḏ* + infinitive occurs 5 times but nowhere else in vv. 16-44. The verbs are arranged palindromically: the titular clause in v. 20 has *šmd* and *'bd; klh* appears in v. 21 (with the extension *mē'al hā'ᵃḏāmâ 'ᵃšer-'attâ ḇā'-šāmmâ lᵉrištāh;* cf. Ex. 32:12). Then the order is reversed: v. 22 has *'bd* and v. 24 *šmd.* The rhetorical figure shows that the three verbs are synonymous in this text. The extension of the central statement probably relates to all five: in each case the vital ties that bind Israel to its land are broken. The appearance of typically Dtr motifs and expressions in the extension raises the question whether the whole system of five statements may not be Dtr in origin. In each case the textual tradition of the SP and the LXX suggests that not Yahweh but the particular affliction may have been the original agent — although in the main clauses Yahweh clearly acts as agent. Here, where the infinitive construction serves to emphasize the radical nature of Yahweh's actions, he acts not as the God of political history but as the controller of forces of nature that may be either beneficent or deadly, as he wills. From v. 25 on, where "enemies" appear, this infinitive construction is not used.

The two other clusters of these three words denoting destruction in Dt. 28 are accounted for most easily — at least from the synchronic perspective — as allusions to the rhetorical system of vv. 20-24. In v. 45, which echoes the language of the framing vv. 2 and 15 (*bw' 'al* and *nśg,* which do not appear subsequently in the chapter), the

threat of destruction is expressed by the infinitive construction (*šmd;* also *'bd* in LXX; within ch. 28, only v. 45 incorporates the vb. *rdp* from v. 22). This verse summarizes not only the threats of illness and natural disaster, but all the curses listed in vv. 16-44 *(kol-haqqᵉlālôṯ hā'ēlleh).* This is reinterpretation. That the primary purpose is to emphasize that the enemy are also involved in driving the curse to its radical outcome is shown by the continuation of the text in vv. 47-48, which speak explicitly of the "enemies" sent by Yahweh. This statement ends in v. 48 with another instance of the infinitive construction, this time with *šmd.* It nevertheless continues on, and concludes once more (and more clearly) with a double infinitive construction *(šmd* and *'bd)* in v. 51. If we are willing to grant that in v. 45 the longer text of the LXX might be original, then a palindromic net also embraces the rhetorical structure of vv. 45-51.

Inclusion of the enemy in Yahweh's definitive act of destruction threatened in the curses is thus assured. Following a narrative intermezzo (vv. 52-57) that describes the terrors of a siege, the two lexemes of total destruction, *šmd* and *'bd,* appear once more at the end of Dt. 28. Again they serve the purpose of a reinterpretation, which begins in v. 58. V. 61 draws on the content and language of v. 20 (cf. the vb. *dbq,* which occurs within Dt. 28 only in vv. 21 and 60, and the allusion to *nkh* in v. 22 by *makkâ* in vv. 59 and 61); repeating the infinitive construction with *šmd,* it extends the threat from the explicit curses to additional curses that are conceivable but not stated explicitly, again radicalizing the message.

But this analysis is misleading. This passage is only the springboard to a restriction. Vv. 61ff. describe the effects of what has been foretold, and the description contains a surprise: there are survivors, albeit in a different land, in exile. Here too the intended reinterpretation is signaled by an echo: *mē'al hā'ᵃḏāmâ 'ᵃšer-'attâ ḇā'-šāmmâ lᵉrištāh* (v. 63) repeats the center of the palindrome in v. 21 (in Dt. 28 this formula appears only in these two verses; the change of number in v. 63 may point directly to the presence of a quotation). Life in exile will be bitter. But this text does not end with an infinitive construction conveying the totality of the destruction. Instead, in v. 63 the two vbs. *šmd* and *'bd* appear in finite form as a kind of new title, which the following verses develop as they depict life in exile. The semantics of *šmd* must have been open to this explication.[24] But these curses used it earlier in a different sense, and so we have here a genuine reinterpretation of earlier language. It is generally assumed that a Dtr hand, exilic at the earliest, has been at work at the end of Dt. 28. Since it was important to these Dtr redactors to verify the fulfillment of earlier prophecies, it is remarkable that we find no statement of such fulfillment, using the word *šmd,* at the end of DtrH, as strongly as Dt. 28 would lead us to expect it. There is not even any language reinterpreting the final occurrences of *šmd* in Dt. 28. The reinterpretation within Deuteronomy was clearly difficult enough. This reinterpretation made it possible, when the foretold history came to pass, to avoid using the word again.

The occurrences of *šmd* in Dt. 4:26; 6:15; 7:4 anticipate its use in Dt. 28. All three texts appear in parenetic exposition of the first commandment, which already alludes

24. See I.3.c above.

in certain places to the blessings and curses of Dt. 28. The same reinterpretation as at the end of Dt. 28 appears in 4:26-28, but the amelioration goes a step further: return from exile is already envisioned. The occurrence in Josh. 23:15 is even earlier and is clearly inspired by Dt. 6:15; for DtrN, the presumed author of Josh. 23, also worked on Dt. 6:18-19.[25]

In Dt. 7:4 *šmd* has attracted the circumstantial qualifier *mahēr,* probably associated originally with the parallel word *'bd* in 4:26; 9:3; 28:20. The reason may be that this passage places limits on *šmd* as an effect of God's anger. This anger is kindled in 7:4 against a plural "you" *(bāḵem),* but the quick destruction strikes only a singular *(wᵉhišmîḏᵉḵā).* From 7:3 on, the singular "you" being addressed may have shifted from personified Israel to the head of each Israelite family. God's anger would then be inflicted only on him, as the responsible representative of the family. This would fit with the reinterpretation of the Decalog that follows immediately in 7:9-10, where we find the expression *'el-pānāyw,* equivalent to *mahēr.*

The occurrence of *šmd* in Isa. 48:19 is probably a distant echo of its usage in the Dtr blessings and curses. This is shown by the appearance of the root itself together with the logic of vv. 17-19, which cannot be explained on the basis of either Ps. 81 or the Decalog: God's self-introduction — obedience to the law — blessings *and* curses, depending on conduct. Naturally the text also incorporates other biblical motifs. Primarily noteworthy, however, is the couching of the whole passage in the counterfactual mode.[26] The protasis in v. 18a is a past counterfactual condition: "If you had paid attention to my commandments. . . ." It is followed by two past counterfactual apodoses: ". . . then your peace would have been like a river, and your righteousness like the waves of the sea; then your seed would have been like the sand, the fruit of your loins like its grains." Now, however, the tense changes, and there follows a future potential: "Never would be cut off *(yikkārēṯ),* never would be extirpated *(yiššāmēḏ)* their name from my presence." Israel's disobedience to the commandments has thus made conceivable the extirpation of its name. But this has not yet taken place. And this pericope is embedded in Deutero-Isaiah's great prophecy of salvation. As in DtrH, the text avoids presenting the *šmd* of the Dtr curses as an accomplished fact.

There is another special aspect of Isa. 48:19: the *šmd* event would not dissolve Israel's ties with the land, but rather Israel's access to God's presence. It is worth noting, however, that in Jon. 1:3,10 the expression *millipnê yhwh* describes Jonah's flight from the land.

The late exilic text Dt. 4:3 conceals a restriction of the *šmd* threatening all Israel to just those within Israel who have sinned. This restriction is legitimized by such narratives as Josh. 7 and the dynastic extermination texts in the books of Kings; it is also clothed in a highly interpretive reminiscence of the sin involving Baal of Peor (Nu. 25:1-9), the context of which uses the vb. *klh* (25:11; cf. Dt. 28:21).

b. *Sin at Horeb.* According to Deuteronomy, the threat of *šmd* hung over Israel from

25. Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 98.
26. F. Delitzsch, *Isaiah II. KD,* 254-55.

the beginning of its history, from its sin at Horeb. The word "Horeb" is a leitmotif pervading the Dtr account in Dt. 9–10 (9:8,14,19,20,25), along with the root *ḥṭ'* (9:16,18,21,27; cf. the dynastic extermination texts in Kings), the motif of Yahweh's anger (9:7,8,19,20,22; cf. also the extermination texts), and the root *šḥt* (9:12,26; 10:10). These linguistic elements clearly serve to express a systematic interpretation of earlier traditions. Only in Deuteronomy do the roots *šmd* and *ḥṭ'* occur together. The same is true of *šmd* and *šḥt* within the entire Pentateuch. The parallel account in Exodus does not use *šmd,* not even in portions often considered Dtr (Ex. 32:9-14). The root *šmd* is thus specific to the book of Deuteronomy as a means of interpreting the tradition of Israel's sin at Horeb. Both texts, however, do use the root *ḥṭ'* (Ex. 32:21,30-34 — albeit 3 times in the phrase *ḥᵃṭā'â gᵉḏōlâ,* which does not appear in Dt. 9), the motif of Yahweh's anger (Ex. 32:10-12, though with different terminology), and the root *šḥt* (Ex. 32:7). In Dt. 9 the consequence of Yahweh's anger is *šmd,* where Ex. 32:10 has *'kl* and 32:12 has *hrg* and *klh mē'al pᵉnê hā'ᵃḏāmâ.* Probably a prior terminology has been superseded here by *šmd,* borrowed from the curse texts of Dt. 28 in order to establish a theological context.

This context has a double significance. On the one hand, the threat of destruction has been hanging over Israel since Horeb. On the other, ever since Horeb there has always been the possibility that despite even the most terrible of all sins the curse might be arrested by intercession and divine forgiveness. The foregrounded word *šmd,* common to both texts, makes Dt. 9 and 28 mutually interpretive. These texts have been shaped to make a single theological statement. It is unlikely that Ex. 32:9-14, or even the entire text of Ex. 32, knows them and in a sense reduces them once more to something less theological or to a narrative with only a diffuse or occasional theological interpretation.

Ultimately, the sin at Horeb is stylized to reflect the bull cult introduced by Jeroboam I. According to the books of Kings, the "sin of Jeroboam" leads to the extermination of royal houses in the northern kingdom, but not to the *šmd* of Israel. This fact, probably given in the sources of DtrH, is also explained by Dt. 9–10.

In Dt. 9:14, a crucial text, the statement of God's intent to destroy *('ašmîḏēm)* is expanded by the addition of *'emḥeh 'eṯ-šᵉmām mittaḥaṯ haššāmayim.* This association of the latter expression with *šmd* is unique. The verb may have been inspired by Ex. 32:32-33. In the context of Deuteronomy, however, the clause as a whole draws an explosive parallel between Israel and Amalek: cf. Ex. 17:14 and Dt. 25:19. Perhaps the text is meant to prepare the way for DtrH's statement of God's judgment in 2 K. 14:27. Dt. 29:19(20) then uses the same expression to declare the punishment of an individual Israelite who harbors secret reservations while swearing to accept God's covenant.

Ps. 106:19-23 summarizes the story of the sin at Horeb. Since v. 23 uses *šmd* in parallel with *šḥt,* the Dtr version is presupposed.

c. *Destruction of Indigenous Nations.* In Deuteronomy the theme of the destruction of indigenous nations during Israel's entry into Canaan is a Dtr addition, as is the use of *šmd* to express this theme. The relevant texts are: Dt. 2:12b; 7:23-24; 9:3; 12:30; 31:3-4; Josh. 9:24; 11:14,20; 24:8; 2 K. 21:9 (= 2 Ch. 33:9). Related texts influenced by this theme include: Dt. 1:27; 2:12a,21-23; 33:27; Am. 2:9; Ps. 83:11(10); 106:34; 1 Ch.

5:25; 2 Ch. 20:10,23. The theme uses *šmd* along with several other verbs, but it is not the most common: in Deuteronomy and Joshua, where it appears 12 times in the context of the destruction of indigenous people, the same context uses *nkh* 36 times, *yrš* hiphil 23 times, and *ḥrm* 20 times. In these passages *šmd* appears primarily in summary statements. It can therefore be used by late biblical texts as a term for the entire process, as well as other historical events similar in nature. This usage is already found in Deuteronomy (2:12,21,22,23).

What distinguishes the use of *šmd* for the destruction of these nations from its use in the curses on Israel and the Horeb narrative is primarily the absence of a focus on some previous offense, in this case on the part of the destroyed nations (contrast, e.g., Gen. 15:13-16). In particular, the vb. *ḥṭ'* never appears. There are, of course, hints as to why Yahweh had problems with the seven nations, so that Israel could not live side by side with them. For example, Dt. 12:31 (with *šmd* in v. 30) states that these nations had done all kinds of abhorrent things hated by Yahweh in the worship of their gods (cf. also 18:12). If they are not destroyed — in fact, even after they are destroyed — they can be a snare to Israel, should it decide to imitate them (v. 30; cf. 7:2-4; Josh. 23:12-13). But the text is never concerned to make the *šmd* statement itself more plausible by citing a moral or ethical motivation. Here the highly moralistic book of Deuteronomy displays a sphere that is premoralistic or transcends morality, a sphere that assumes different forms in the various strata.

The fundamental stratum is the Dtr stratum, probably Josianic, that extends from Dt. 1 through Josh. 22 ("Dtr Landeroberungserzählung" = DtrL).[27] The comments of the narrator interpolated in Dt. 2:10-12,20-23 probably belong to this stratum and are not late interpolations, as is usually thought.[28] Here *šmd* occurs four times in the space of a few verses and is inflicted on several nations.

The vb. *šmd* makes its first appearance in this stratum after the return of the spies to Kadesh-barnea. The people's lack of faith expresses itself in their fear that Yahweh wants to destroy Israel by handing it over to the Amorites (Dt. 1:27). Here, at the very beginning of the narrative, *šmd* appears as a danger coming from Yahweh that hovers over the history of a nation without any justification traceable to its moral conduct.

This amoral perspective is even more evident in the movements of Israel in the Transjordan (Dt. 2). Yahweh himself in his instructions to Israel and the narrator of the book in interpretive interruptions develop an historical geography of the territory both west and east of the Jordan. By Yahweh's sovereign decree, certain indigenous nations throughout the entire region, identified by name and characteristics, are dispossessed by invading nations. The initial situation is that these nations formerly dwelt in the region in question: *lᵉpānîm yāšᵉḇû ḇāh* (2:10). The process itself is described with the aid of two expressions: *šmd* hiphil *mippᵉnê X* and *yšb taḥaṯ X*. Sometimes we also find lexemes using the root *yrš*. According to 2:12, Israel's occupation of the land follows this pattern. The only case in which the geographical origin of other invading nations is

27. Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 92-96.

28. Lohfink, "Stimmen."

given even suggests a parallel to the exodus of Israel from Egypt: the Philistines in Gaza are the *kaptōrîm hayyōṣᵉ'îm mikkaptôr* (2:23; cf. Am. 9:7). The grammatical subjects of the *šmd* action alternate according to the schema A-B-B-A (Dt. 2:12,21,22,23). As we would expect, they are always Yahweh and the invader in question. This follows from the structure of the narrative interpolations, which are obviously governed by the rules of mutual rhetorical supplementation based on the logic of parallelism.[29]

The claim that the Edomites are the grammatical subject of *šmd* hiphil in 2:12a requires text-critical discussion. In the MT (and LXX) the situation is clear. In the SP, however, Yahweh is the subject. The consonantal text of both textual traditions can be explained by an original *wyšmdm* (cf. the absence of *matres lectionis* in 2:21,23), which developed into MT *wayyašmîḏûm* and SP *wyšmdm yhwh*. The change in SP is probably accounted for by the following *mippᵉnêhem*. In Deuteronomy and Joshua the verbs used for the destruction of nations (7 times *šmd*) are followed in 24 instances by *mippᵉnê X*. Except in Dt. 2:12, Yahweh is always the subject of the verb. Indeed, it is clearly the intention of these expressions to characterize the process of destruction as an act of Yahweh using human instrumentalities. To eliminate the exceptional 2:12, the SP assimilated it to 2:21 (thus creating the "theologically" superior text[30]). In order to guarantee the proper continuation of the clause, a *yîrāšûm* also had to be added from 2:21. Indeed, the unique constellation of 2:12 was possible only because 2:22 used the normal language to describe the destruction at the hands of the same Edomites, improving the "untheological" initial statement in 2:12.

In the story of the wars of destruction against Sihon and Og in Dt. 2–3, *šmd* does not occur. In DtrL it describes these events only in the retrospective summary in 31:4, which follows the prospective promise in v. 3 of the destruction (also *šmd*) of the nations west of the Jordan. Here too no motivation is stated. Instead of the expected *mippāneyḵā*, v. 3 has *millᵉpāneyḵā* (found otherwise only in 9:4 and Josh. 23:5 — late strata), echoing the preceding statement that Yahweh himself will cross the Jordan *lᵉpāneyḵā*. Almost by accident, this passage makes philologically clear that the usual expression *mippāneyḵā* in these contexts cannot possibly be translated colorlessly as "on your account." The *pānîm* of Israel is Israel's appearance headed by the ark and ready to do battle. It is better understood as: "when you charge."

We find the word *šmd* once more in DtrL when the Gibeonites tell what they have heard about Yahweh's command to conquer the land (Josh. 9:24). It should be noted that Yahweh's *hašmîḏ . . . mippᵉnêḵem* echoes the previous inhabitants' *wannîrā' mᵉ'ōḏ lᵉnapšōṯênû mippᵉnêḵem*. We find *šmd* again only in the summary of the campaign west of the Jordan in Josh. 11:12-20, for the first time in this stratum linked closely with the vb. *ḥrm* hiphil (vv. 14,20). As the immediate cause of the destruction, v. 20 names the will of the nations to resist Israel — but it was Yahweh who instilled this will in them. Here the story of Sihon (Dt. 2:30) and the law governing war (Dt. 20:10) stand instruc-

29. For a more detailed discussion see Lohfink, "Stimmen."

30. L. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium. BK* V/1 (1990), 142.

tively in the background. The destruction of the nations is occasioned by the conduct of those who are destroyed. But this motivation is itself created by Yahweh.

The root *šmd* appears as a shorthand term summarizing the conquest in texts from the hand of a Dtr exilic redactor: Dt. 12:30 and 2 K. 21:9 (= 2 Ch. 33:9).[31]

A late perspective appears in Dt. 7:23,24 and 9:3. There is no consensus concerning the stratum to which these texts belong. The analysis that follows presupposes that the primary redaction of the present text of Dt. 7:1–9:8,22-24 was accomplished by a late exilic hand that revised and expanded the Dtn parenesis of the first commandment — "Dtr Überarbeiter" (DtrÜ).[32] In this revision DtrÜ responds to the commentaries of "DtrN" in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges on the question of the destruction of nations and the conquest.[33] The primary theses of DtrÜ are: (1) it is far from true that Israel destroyed all the nations and conquered the entire land; (2) this is because Yahweh made his help in this task conditional on perfect observance of the law — which Israel failed to do. The primary text of DtrN is Josh. 23, but it also includes the textual expansion in Dt. 6:18-19, which DtrÜ picks up on starting in Dt. 7.

In reworking DtrL, DtrN introduced a new lexeme into the conquest topos (*hdp,* Dt. 6:19; Josh. 23:5 — used and reinterpreted by DtrÜ in 9:4). DtrÜ in turn expands the vocabulary by four additional verbs, which are found only here in this context within Deuteronomy and Joshua: *nšl* (Dt. 7:1,22), *'kl* (7:16; cf. 9:3), *'bd* (7:20,24; 8:20; 9:3), and *kn'* (9:3). By using *'bd,* which is completely parallel to *šmd* in Dt. 28, DtrÜ establishes an analogy to the covenant curses (see esp. 8:20). In the case of the other newly introduced verbs, one may ask whether DtrÜ may not be seeking to mitigate the harsh sense of *šmd* by varying the terminology.

The first appearance of *šmd* is in the context of 7:20-24. Here DtrÜ, drawing constantly on the material in Ex. 23:27-30, responds to the first, historical thesis of DtrN.[34] But the key word in Ex. 23 was still *grš,* "drive out," rather than *šmd,* which the existing text of Deuteronomy made obligatory for DtrÜ. DtrÜ insists that Yahweh carries out his promise to destroy all the nations of the promised land. The historical facts that conflict with this view (*hanniš'ārîm,* 7:20; cf. Josh. 23:4,7,12) he ascribes — following Ex. 23 — to God's intent that the process proceed slowly, so that the wild animals do not gain the upper hand (7:22). After 7:23 has used *šmd* of the *nations,* 7:24 goes on to use it only of their *kings.* Is DtrÜ thinking only of texts like Josh. 10–12, so that the verse simply elaborates v. 23 by adding a concrete detail? Or is v. 24 to be understood as a restrictive commentary on v. 23, so that the word *šmd* is accounted for sufficiently by the elimination of the indigenous royal families (*malkêhem* and *šᵉmām:* v. 24)? Possibly the term *šmd* also has an attenuated sense in 9:3, where DtrÜ uses it once more, this time in parallel with *kn'* hiphil, which means something like "humble, humiliate" — that is more innocuous.

---

31. On the assignment of texts to different strata see Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 97.

32. Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 99-100.

33. Ibid., 98f.

34. On the relation of this text to Ex. 23, see M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1985), 201-3.

DtrÜ responds to the second, theological thesis of DtrN in Dt. 9:1-6. Of course he must tie his interpretation to the word *šmd,* which is already present in the text. He therefore uses it in 9:3 (in part an expanded version of 31:3), but does not insist on it. Now he finally bases the destruction of indigenous nations on a moralistic principle. V. 5 concedes that Yahweh destroys (*yrš* hiphil) these nations because of their wickedness *(bᵉriš'aṯ haggôyim hā'ēlleh).* But the moralistic perspective is immediately transcended: Israel itself is not righteous and upright *(lō' ḇᵉṣiḏqāṯᵉḵā ûḇᵉyōšer lᵉḇāḇᵉḵā).* The description of the sin at Horeb that follows will prove the contrary. Yahweh's destruction of the nations on behalf of Israel is motivated solely by his oath to the patriarchs. The DtrÜ returns once more to a higher plane, with a nonmoralistic view of the destruction of the nations. He reclaims the mystery of God's freedom. The promise of the land to the patriarchs had already dominated the picture in DtrL.

As to the prehistory of *šmd* in the context of the conquest: it appears with *ḥrm* hiphil and *yrš* hiphil where Ex. 23:23 uses *kḥd* hiphil and 34:11 uses *grš.* DtrÜ is also familiar with Ex. 23:28,29,30,31, all of which have *grš.* Two passages use *šmd* in parallel with the two earlier words: *kḥd* in 1 K. 13:23 and *grš* in Dt. 33:27. The present text of Josh. 24:2-24 uses *šmd* (v. 8) and *grš* (vv. 12,18) interchangeably. In the Blessing of Moses and Josh. 24, if both texts are pre-Dtr, the highly abstract basic meaning of *šmd* discussed above provides a kind of legitimation for turning *grš,* "drive out," from Ex. 34:11 into Dtr *šmd,* "destroy."[35] In Dtr usage *šmd* understood in this sense and used as a summary term joined the vbs. *ḥrm* hiphil and *yrš* hiphil, already used by the ancient war narratives to describe the conquest. The crucial fact, of course, was that at least the primary Dtr stratum really wanted to speak of destroying the indigenous nations. Whether Am. 2:9 can also be associated with the prehistory of the Dtr theologoumenon of the destruction of the nations or whether it belongs to a later stage of development depends on the diachronic analysis of the book of Amos, which we cannot go into here. The concrete imagery of Am. 2:9 does not exactly suggest a borrowing of the abstract Dtr cliché.

9. *bāmôṯ.* We have noted that the victims of *šmd* are human beings. In Hos. 10:8, however, it is the *bāmôṯ 'āwen* that will be destroyed, so that instead of the sacrifices that rise up *('lh)* on the altars, thorns and thistles will grow up *('lh)* there. The reason is given in an appositive phrase: the *bāmôṯ 'āwen* are the *ḥaṭṭa'ṯ yiśrā'ēl.* There is presumably a connection with the appearance of the root *ḥṭ'* in texts concerning the "sin of Jeroboam" and the sin of Israel at Horeb. Was it possible to use *šmd* here because the *bāmôṯ* are also associated with the cult of the dead? The unusual usage remains obscure.

But we find the same object used with *šmd* in Lev. 26:30 and Nu. 33:52. In the curse text from H, Yahweh says that he will destroy the *bāmôṯ.* The whole verse appears to be a free imitation of Ezk. 6:3-5, capitalizing on the interchangeable use of *šmd* and *'bd* in Dt. 28 to substitute *šmd* for *'bd.* But why? Following a statement about tearing down

35. On the age of Josh. 24 see Koopmans, 1-95; on v. 8 specifically see p. 329 n. 345.

the incense altars, an expansion of the Ezekiel text says: *w^enāṯattî 'eṯ-pigrêḵem 'al-pigrê gillûlêḵem.* The latter might refer to memorial pillars for the departed.[36] Again, the connection with the cult of the dead may have made it possible to use *šmd.*

Nu. 33:50-56 contains a command, belonging to a very late stratum, to take possession of the land. On the basis of Dtr texts, it presupposes the interchangeability of the various verbs for the conquest, used in the same verse; the object of *šmd* is *bāmôṯ.*

One may ask whether the LXX has anything to contribute to the discussion of these three passages with *bāmôṯ.* Its standard translation of *bāmâ* in the Pentateuch is *stḗlē;* Lev. 26:30 is the first occurrence. Does this translation reflect a different meaning of *bāmâ* in the late period? This possibility could also lead in the direction of the cult of the dead, with which the fundamental meaning of *šmd* postulated above has points of contact.

10. *Apocalyptic.* We find *šmd* used occasionally in a looser sense in late apocalyptic contexts: Isa. 26:14; Mic. 5:13(14); Hag. 2:22; Zec. 12:9; Dnl. 7:26; 11:44. The usage in the last-named passage may be compared to that in Esther.

11. *Esther.* The hiphil of *šmd* appears in Esther in 3:6,13; 4:8; 7:4; 8:11. The triad *l^ehašmîḏ lah^arōḡ ûl^e'abbēḏ* occurs 3 times (3:13; 7:4; 8:11). In the royal decree issued at Haman's instigation, it defines the action planned against the Jews. Its third occurrence is in the new royal decree, this time supportive of the Jews, now describing the action that the Jews are allowed to take against their enemies. The two decrees are based on the principle of talion. But this observation touches only on the background before which something totally different lexemically is taking place. To see it, we need to examine all three verbs of the triad.

The verb used in every case, which appears a total of 10 times, is the piel of *'bd* (the root appears 15 times). It can denote the intentions of Haman as well as the actions of the Jews, but also the fears of Esther. It dominates the atmosphere of the book. The vb. *šmd,* on the other hand, occurs only 5 times. It appears for the first time in 3:6, where Haman conceives his plan. In this context it clearly refers to genocide, the total extermination of the Jews throughout the entire empire. In 3:13 the word appears in the royal decree. In 4:8 it summarizes this decree at the moment when Mordecai arranges for Esther to receive a copy. It appears once more in 7:4, when Esther quotes the decree to the king. Finally, it appears in the second decree, which is patterned after the first. But a place where it does *not* appear is also relevant: Est. 9, which describes the actions taken by the Jews against their opponents, does not mention *šmd.* Despite the plenary powers granted them, the Jews make no use of *šmd.*

Instead of *šmd,* the root *hrg* is now foregrounded. Elsewhere in the OT, *hrg* occurs only once in conjunction with *šmd* (2 S. 14:7), and there not in strict parallelism. In Esther *hrg* occurs a total of 10 times, including 7 times in ch. 9. Previously it appeared only in the triad within the decree. This word, then, characterizes the Jewish counter-

36. D. Neiman, *JBL* 67 (1948) 58.

action. The Jews act only against the specific individuals who turned against them. Beyond that, they do not even make use of the authority they have been granted to plunder.

The wordplay involving the three verbs of the triad in the royal decree thus displays the enormous difference between the intended pogrom and the Jewish response. The Dtr usage of *šmd* in the context of the occupation of the land extends its meaning to "genocide"; here it helps make the statement that the Jews do not allow themselves to be a party to such an action, even if they were its intended victims.

Lohfink

שָׁמַט *šāmaṭ;* שְׁמִטָּה *šᵉmiṭṭâ*

I. Cognates. II. Occurrences and Meaning: 1. OT; 2. Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls. III. *šᵉmiṭṭâ:* 1. OT; 2. Postbiblical Period.

I. Cognates. The root *šmṭ,* which in Hebrew may have the basic meaning "let loose, detach, pull off," is found also in many other Semitic languages,[1] although (later?) linguistic development exhibits various shades of meaning: Akk. *šamāṭu,* "pull off";[2] Arab. *samaṭa,* "scald, pour hot water over, suspend";[3] Amhar. *šemeṭṭeṭa;*[4] Aram. *šᵉmaṭ;*[5] Syr. *šᵉmaṭ* (in the Syriac Bible, often for "drawing" a sword: Ex. 15:9; Lev.

šāmaṭ. A. Cohen, "'Leaving the Land Fallow,'" *BethM* 24 (1978) 45-49 (Heb.); W. Dietrich, "'. . . den Armen das Evangelium verkünden,'" *TZ* 41 (1985) 31-43, esp. 36-41; C. H. Gordon, "Parallèles Nouziens aux lois et coutumes de le l'AT," *RB* 44 (1935) 35-41, esp. 38-41; F. Horst, *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), esp. 79-103, 212-15, 279; N. P. Lemche, "Andurārum and mîšarum," *JNES* 38 (1979) 11-22; J. Lewy, "The Biblical Institution of *dᵉrôr* in the Light of Accadian Documents," *ErIsr* 5 (1958) 21-31; R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), esp. 106-15; R. North, "*Yâd* in the Shemitta-Law," *VT* 4 (1954) 196-99; N. M. Sarna, "Zedekiah's Emancipation of Slaves and the Sabbatical Year," in H. Hoffner, ed., *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 143-49; R. K. Sikkema, *De lening in het OT* (Hague, 1957), esp. 85-88; B. Uffenheimer, *"Šabbath — šᵉmiṭṭâh — yôbēl," BethM* 30 (1984/85) 28-40; H. M. Weil, "Gage et cautionnement dans la Bible," *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* 2 (1938) 171-241, esp. 186-94; R. Westbook, "שמטה," *EMiqr,* VIII (1982), 112-19; C. J. H. Wright, "What Happened Every Seven Years in Israel?" *EvQ* 56 (1984) 129-38, 193-201.

1. *HAL,* II, 1537.

2. *AHw,* III, 1155.

3. Wehr, 430; cf. Lane, I/4, 1426-27.

4. Leslau, *Contributions,* 54.

5. *DISO,* 308; Mur 24B:14; C:12; E:9 (*DJD,* II [1961], 125, 128, 131); *WTM,* IV, 573; J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 39.7 (= Mur 18:7); A50.5; 51.5; 52.5.

26:33; Nu. 22:23,31; etc.);[6] Mand. *šmṭ*.[7] It is possible that *šmṭ* may be a so-called shaphel form of the root *mûṭ*, "totter."[8]

II. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *OT.* In the OT the verb *šmṭ* occurs 7 times in the qal (Ex. 23:11; Dt. 15:2; 2 S. 6:6; 2 K. 9:33 [bis]; Jer. 17:4; 1 Ch. 13:9); the niphal occurs only in Ps. 141:6 and the hiphil only in Dt. 15:3. The noun *šᵉmiṭṭâ* occurs 5 times, all in Deuteronomy: 15:1,2(bis),9; 31:10.

It is clear from 2 K. 9:33 that the basic meaning of *šmṭ* in secular usage is "throw out"[9] or "throw down," because Jehu's accomplices in Jezreel throw queen Jezebel out of a window (reading *šimṭûhā* [*Q*]). The verb also occurs with this meaning in Ps. 141:6, although interpretation of the text presents serious problems. The beginning of the verse means literally: "Thrown down to the power of [or: alongside] the rock their judges." Many scholars find these words "totally meaningless."[10] Gunkel emends the consonantal text of this line so that it can be read as: "And the pernicious prattle of their lips would have led me astray."[11] Dahood, on the contrary, believes that the line as recorded in the MT actually has meaning, and translates: "Let their judges drop into the clutches of the Crag" (in contrast to "the clutches of the snare" in v. 9).[12] In this case "the Crag" refers to Yahweh.

The precise meaning of *šmṭ* in 2 S. 6:6 (par. 1 Ch. 13:9) is also difficult to determine. The passage describes the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem, in the course of which Uzzah was struck by Yahweh near "the threshing floor of Nacon" (1 Ch. 13:9: Chidon), because he had reached out his hand and taken hold of it. He did this because, the text says, the oxen *šāmᵉṭû*. Various translations have been suggested: they "slipped" (Buber-Rosenzweig), "stumbled" (NEB), "tried to overturn it" (ZB), "broke loose" (EÜ), "shook it" (NRSV). Here (and in 1 Ch. 13:9) the LXX translates: "for the young ox [cf. 1 Ch. 13:9 Vg.: *bos quippe lasciviens*] made it [the ark or the cart] veer." In other words, it reads *šmṭw* as *šᵉmāṭô* (also cited by *BHS* as an emendation in 1 Ch. 13:9; the Syr. interprets the Hebrew in 2 S. 6:6 as "[the oxen] slipped their reins" and in 1 Ch. 13:9 as "they ran to the threshing floor"). There is probably no clear evidence in Biblical Hebrew for an intransitive meaning of the verb in the qal.[13] The text means that the oxen tried to "throw over" the cart (or the ark).

---

6. *LexSyr,* 785.

7. *MdD,* 469-70.

8. → VIII, 152-53; on the problem of shaphel forms in Hebrew see *VG,* I, 522, 525; G. J. Thierry, *OTS* 7 (1950) 143-45; 9 (1951) 4-5; F. Rundgren, *Über Bildungen mit* (š)- *und* n-t-*Demonstrativen im Semitischen* (Uppsala, 1955), 123ff.; C. J. Labuschagne, *OTWSA* 10 (1971) 51-64.

9. Westbrook, 112.

10. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 598.

11. See also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 525-26, 528; O. Loretz, *Psalmen II: 90–150. AOAT* 207/2 (1979), 352.

12. M. Dahood, *Psalms,* III, *AB* (1970), 308, 312-13.

13. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* (1984), 164.

The text of Jer. 17:4 is also difficult: *ûḇᵉḵā* hardly makes sense in this context; the reading in Dt. 15:3 (cf. also LXX [Origen], although the other [major] mss. lack Jer. 17:1-4; also Vg.) suggests the emendation *yāḏᵉḵā.*[14] The basic meaning of the verb here is nevertheless clear: "You shall loose your hand from your heritage, which I gave you."

In Ex. 23:11 and Dt. 15:3, finally, *šāmaṭ* has the specialized meaning associated with the noun *šᵉmiṭṭâ* in Dt. 15 and 31.[15] The legislation of the Covenant Code (Ex. 23:11) deals with the regulation of the rhythm of labor and rest, culminating in the institution of the Sabbatical Year. For six years the land may be sown and its yield gathered, but "the seventh year you shall let it lie fallow and not cultivate it" (cf. EÜ). Here *šmṭ* has the meaning "leave fallow," while the immediately following verb, *nṭš,* "let be, relinquish,"[16] adds interpretive nuance. In the seventh year not just the fields but also the vineyards and olive orchards are to be "thrown out," i.e., left to themselves, so that the poor of the people and even the animals of the field may live freely from the yield of the land. This leaves open the question whether the seventh year is "absolute" or "relative."[17]

Dt. 15:3 deals with the remission — also in the seventh year — of a claim held by a creditor against a neighbor who is a member of the community. Only here, in defining the *šᵉmiṭṭâ,* is the verb used in the hiphil[18] with *yāḏ* as its object: the Israelite creditor is to "throw out" (EÜ "leave fallow") the debt "of his brother," while being allowed to collect it from a foreigner.[19]

2. *Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls.* The LXX always translates *šᵉmiṭṭâ* with *áphesis* (in combination with *poieín* in Ex. 23:11 and Dt. 15:3, using *aphíein* in Dt. 15:2). Especially in Lev. 25 and 27, this word is frequently used to translate Biblical Heb. *yôḇēl;* it is also used to translate *dᵉrôr.*[20] In 2 S. 6:6 we find *perispân* used for *šmṭ;* in the par. 1 Ch. 13:9 we find *ekklínein.* In Ps. 140(MT 141):6 we find *katapotheín,* and in 2 K. 9:33, *kylíein.* (There is no LXX version of Jer. 17:3 in the major mss.[21]) Clearly the LXX does not translate the Hebrew vb. *šmṭ* uniformly. The approach of the Vg. is analogous: it always translates *šᵉmiṭṭâ* with *remissio,* but treats the verbal forms variously, as is immediately clear from the translations in 2 S. 6:6 and 1 Ch. 13:9: *(quoniam) calcitrabant (boves)* (2 S. 6:6), *(bos quippe lasciviens) paululum inclinaverat eam* (1 Ch. 13:9).

Although the Syr. version has a vb. *šmṭ* used in a different sense,[22] only *šûḇqānā* is

---

14. This emendation is accepted by B. Duhm, *Jeremia. KHC* XI (1901), 143; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 114; A. Weiser, *Jeremia. ATD* XX (⁶1969), 148; W. McKane, *Jeremiah 1. ICC* (1986), 386-87; Westbrook, 113; *HAL,* II, 1557.

15. See III.1 below.

16. → IX, 407-12.

17. See III.1 below.

18. Although Horst, 90, and others read the qal here.

19. See III.1 below.

20. → III, 265-69, esp. 267; R. Bultmann, *TDNT,* I, 510.

21. See II.1 above.

22. See I above.

found for *šᵉmiṭṭâ*. In the other instances, the Syr., like LXX and Vg., employs quite different translations, above all in the parallel texts 2 S. 6:6 ("the oxen slipped their reins") and 1 Ch. 13:9 ("because the oxen ran to the threshing floor"). Generally the Tg. follows the usage of the MT, although it does use *mrg* in 2 S. 6:6//1 Ch. 13:9 but *mgr* in 2 K. 9:33. (Some exegetes have proposed emending the former verses on the basis of the latter.)

In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šᵉmiṭṭâ* occurs in 1QM 2:6,8 (//4QMᶠ 7:3); 4Q513 18 3; 4Q260(4QSᵇ) 1 6:7(bis),9,10,12,13[23] and the vb. *šmṭ* in 1Q22 3:4-5.[24] The noun *šmṭh* is also found in the mss. from the Murabbaʿat caves (Mur 18:7; 24B:14; C:12; E:9). These texts together with the Aramaic funerary inscriptions from Palestine show that the year of a *šᵉmiṭṭâ* had substantial importance for everyday chronology in the postbiblical period (until approximately the 5th century C.E.; cf. Neh. 10:32).[25]

III. *šᵉmiṭṭâ*.

1. *OT.* Only in Deuteronomy (15:1-2,9; 31:10) is the noun *šᵉmiṭṭâ* used as a term for the general "release" (or "remission") proclaimed according to 31:10 every seven years at the Festival of Booths; this release took on particular significance in the later period. Dt. 15:1 still speaks of a general release (or "letting go"[26]); from vv. 2-3 this release refers explicitly to a creditor's renunciation of claims against a Hebrew debtor ("your brother" [NRSV "a member of the community"]), while the claims may be exacted (*ngś*[27]) from a foreigner.[28] According to von Rad, Merendino, and others, the introductory formula — "every seventh year you shall grant a *šᵉmiṭṭâ*" (15:1) — in this form indicates a sacral institution (cf. Ex. 12:48; 34:22; Dt. 16:1,10,13; also 15:2: *lᵉyhwh*).[29] This requirement has often been associated with the requirement in Ex. 23:11 that the land be allowed to lie fallow, especially since the verb *šmṭ* plays a role in both contexts.

In the "legal interpretation" that follows, Dt. 15:2 extends the "fallow year" institution to debts secured by guarantee of personal liability. "In the year of release, the creditor is deprived of his claim against the debtor, i.e., the right of personal exaction."[30] What does the expression *baʿal maššēh yāḏô* mean here? According to Horst,[31] *maššēh* is a "construct masculine singular hiphil participle," denoting a creditor relationship with a man who "has given his hand as security." The verb *nšʾ* (or *nšh*) denotes not just the loan transaction itself (like *lwh*) but a "legal transaction." As long as the debtor has no guarantor, he is personally, even corporally, liable. But by "striking" the hand of the creditor, the guarantor takes from it the hand of the debtor. By this hand ritual the

23. J. T. Milik, *Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976), 62-64.
24. *DJD*, I (1955), 94-95.
25. Fitzmyer and Harrington, *Manual*, A50.5; 51.5; 52.5. See also B. Z. Wacholder, *HUCA* 44 (1973) 153-96; Dietrich, 40.
26. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1966), 105.
27. → IX, 214.
28. Horst, 79.
29. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 105; Merendino, 107.
30. Horst, 214.
31. Ibid., 82-83.

debtor (or guarantor) expressly gives the creditor the right to attach his own person if the debt is not paid.[32]

According to Weil,[33] however, the debtor and the pledge *(maššâ/maššā')* are always different persons. The pledge is never an abstract liability but a subordinate person — the debtor's slave or son (or own self?). After seven years the *ba'al* (the creditor) must release (= *šmṭ*[34]) the pledge that is in his power (= in his hand). Weil claims that the proclamation preceding this release of the *maššâ/maššā'* is what is meant by the idiom *qr' šᵉmiṭṭâ.*

Others insert *maššeh 'ēṯ* after *ba'al,* i.e., "everyone who possesses a pledge must release the pledge of his hand."[35] In this interpretation the "hand" refers to the creditor, a possibility that finds some support in Neh. 10:32.[36] In the year of *šᵉmiṭṭâ,* a creditor loses the right to take legal action *(ngś)* against the debtor.[37] It remains an open question whether the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* law refers to a "remission of debts," in which the Sabbatical Year cancels the liability of the debtor, or a "moratorium" that temporarily suspends coercive measures. Both views have their supporters.[38] Horst has pointed out correctly that, considering the short term of most loans, a one-year suspension of liability without the possibility of a novation is tantamount to cancellation.[39] Furthermore, we should by no means equate the notion of a "loan" with our "notions of loans based on the whole capitalistic social structure."[40] Nevertheless, Dt. 15:9 appears to comport better with a total remission of debts (as in rabbinic literature) than with a moratorium.[41]

The Sabbatical Year legislation in Lev. 25 is often connected with the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* ordinance in Dt. 15, as is the emancipation of voluntarily enslaved Hebrews in Dt. 15:12-18 (cf. the implications of such a regulation in Jer. 34:8-16[42]). But it would be wrong to identify these latter institutions directly with the festal observance of a "Sabbatical Year," which is probably later. Wellhausen already emphasized correctly that Ex. 23:10-11 does not yet speak of a Sabbatical Year, because there is no indication of an "absolute" seventh year.[43] Like the emancipation of a Hebrew slave six years after purchase (Ex. 21:2-6), the time set for the "release" of the produce of a field is "relative." In Dt. 15:1-6, however, we find that the seventh year no longer applies just to the debts

---

32. Ibid., 86-87.

33. Pp. 187ff.

34. See also North, 199.

35. E.g., *BHS* and Merendino, 108-9.

36. → X, 57.

37. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy,* 106.

38. Horst, 88 n. 189, 190; cf. W. A. van Es, *De eigendom in den Pentateuch* (1909), 249-50; Sikkema, 85ff.

39. P. 88.

40. A. Bertholet, *Deuteronomium. KHC* V (1899), 47; cf. von Rad, *Deuteronomy,* 105-6.

41. Dietrich, 37.

42. Sarna.

43. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Eng. tr. repr. Atlanta, 1994), 116-17; now also Dietrich, 38.

of an individual but is the same for all Hebrews. Here, according to Wellhausen, we already have an "absolute" date. In Lev. 25:1-7, finally, the relative seventh year of Ex. 23:10-11 has become fixed — "not differing from field to field, but a common date for the whole land, a Sabbatical Year after the model of the Sabbath day."

Horst sees the ancient *šᵉmiṭṭâ* ordinance as being based on "ancient cultic institutions," which were adapted to a new situation and given a "charitable definition of purpose."[44] But the possibly ancient cultic significance had been forgotten early on, as we see in the Covenant Code (Ex. 23:11), where a "socio-ethical purpose has been added to the requirement."

In this context we shall mention briefly the Old Babylonian *mīšarum* edicts and the so-called Edicts of Ammisaduqa and Samsuiluna.[45] At least for the First Dynasty of Babylon, these decrees regularly constituted the first significant official acts in the reign of a new king: just order was created *(mīšaram šakānum),* tablets recording debts were broken, a decree was issued *(ṣimdatam šakānum),* taxes and tributes were remitted, enslaved debtors were freed.[46] To free lands and cities of the burden of tributes and taxes, furthermore, in other periods the custom arose of decreeing a cancellation of payments (*andurāram šakānum*[47]), especially in Assyria.[48] Gordon, Lemche, and others emphasize not only that Heb. *dᵉrôr* is cognate with Akk. *andurārum* but also that the laws governing the Sabbatical and Jubilee Years — including the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* — are connected with the Mesopotamian world.[49] (Lewy stresses Amorite influence during the 2d millennium on the OT laws governing the Jubilee Year in Lev. 25:10ff.[50]) Although the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* may have its roots in ancient Near Eastern law, its actual observance is mentioned only implicitly in the OT (e.g., Neh. 10:32).

2. *Postbiblical Period.* We see in 1 Mc. 6:49,53[51] that at least in the intertestamental period the Sabbatical Year was observed regularly. Josephus, too, mentions such years in several passages.[52] Even Tacitus mentions this Jewish custom, albeit contemptuously: "dein [sc. after the Sabbath] blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum" ("the charm of indolence beguiled them into giving up the seventh year also to inaction").[53] We also know of *šᵉmiṭṭâ* years and chronologies from the postbiblical period.[54] The unfortunate consequence that "you might entertain a mean thought, thinking, 'The seventh year, the year of remission, is near,' and therefore view your needy neighbor with hostility and give nothing" (Dt. 15:9), is reported to have in-

44. Pp. 213, 279.
45. For a survey with bibliog. see H. Petschow, *RLA,* III, 269-79.
46. → IV, 181.
47. *AHw,* I, 50.
48. Lemche, 15-21.
49. Gordon, 39; Lemche, 22.
50. P. 29.
51. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 12.378.
52. *Ant.* 13.234; 14.201, 475; etc.
53. *Hist.* 5.4, 6.
54. See II.2 above.

stigated Hillel to eliminate the problem by introducing the so-called prosbul (פרוזבול),[55] a document signed by witnesses or judges allowing a creditor to make the following statement before the court: "I X declare before you, the judges in such-and-such a place, that I may recover any debt owed to me at any time I shall desire."[56] Here *šᵉmiṭṭâ* is virtually identical with "Sabbatical Year."

Mulder†

55. D. Sperber, *Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature* (Jerusalem, 1984), 154ff.

56. *Sheb.* 10:3-7, esp. 4; *Giṭ.* 4:3; see also E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, II (Eng. tr., rev. ed. Edinburgh, 1979), 366-67; St.-B., I, 717-18.

שָׁמַיִם *šāmayim*

I. General: 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Distribution; 3. Semantic Field. II. OT: 1. Cosmology; 2. Heaven and Creation; 3. The Heavens. III. Usage Outside the OT: 1. LXX; 2. Sirach; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāmayim. J. Belzer and O. Knoch, "Himmel," *NBL*, II, 152-56; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum. WUNT* 2 (1951); idem and A. Lumpe, "Himmel," *RAC*, XV, 173-212; W. Eichrodt, "The Celestial World," *Theology of the OT. OTL*, 2 vols. (Eng. tr. 1961-67), II, 186-209; O. Eissfeldt, "Baʿalšamēm und Jahwe," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 1-31 = *KlSchr,* II (1963), 171-98; T. Flügge, *Die Vorstellung über den Himmel im AT* (1937); E. Horning, "Himmelsvorstellungen," *LexÄg*, II, 1215-18; C. Houtman, *Der Himmel im AT. OTS* 30 (1993); H.-J. Kraus, "The Heavenly World," *Theology of the Psalms. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 46-49; W. G. Lambert, "Himmel," *RLA*, IV, 411-12; B. Lang and C. McDannell, *Der Himmel* (1990); É. Levine, "Distinguishing 'Air' from 'Heaven' in the Bible," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 97-99; M. Metzger, "Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes," *UF* 2 (1970) 139-58; J. Nelis, "God and Heaven in the OT," in B. van Iersel and E. Schillebeeckx, eds., *Heaven* (Eng. tr. 1979), 22-33; G. von Rad, "οὐρανός. B. OT," *TDNT*, V, 502-9; R. Rendtorff, "El, Baʿal und Jahwe," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 277-92 = *GSAT. ThB* 57 (1975), 172-87; K. Seybold, "Cosmology," *Introducing the Psalms* (Eng. tr. Edinburgh, 1990), 177-90; U. E. Simon, *Heaven in the Christian Tradition* (New York, 1958); J. A. Soggin, "שָׁמַיִם *šāmáyim* heaven," *TLOT*, III, 1369-72; L. I. J. Stadelmann, *The Hebrew Conception of the World. AnBibl* 39 (1970), esp. 37-61; H. Traub, "οὐρανός. C. The Septuagint and Judaism," *TDNT*, V, 509-12; J. P. Weinberg, "Die Natur im Weltbild des Chronisten," *VT* 31 (1981) 324-45.

I. General.

1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The Hebrew primary noun *šāmayim* (Biblical Aram. **šemayin* or *šemayyā'*) is based on a Common Semitic nominal root **šama(y/w/')*.[1] In the OT, as in all Northwest Semitic dialects and usually in East Semitic, it appears as a *plurale tantum*.[2] The unusual vocalization, which at first glance suggests a dual, is due to the addition of the (here) unaccented plural ending *-im* to the root **šamay*.[3] Even in passages that speak of "the heavens of heavens" (Dt. 10:14; 1 K. 8:27; Ps. 148:4; Neh. 9:6; 2 Ch. 2:5[Eng. 6]; 6:18), the OT thinks in terms of a single heaven, not a multiplicity of heavens (like later texts such as Apoc. Mos. 35, 37; 3 Bar. [Greek] 2ff.; 2 En. 8:22; T. Levi 2:7ff.; 3; 2 Cor. 12:2,4[4]). The double idiom is to be understood as a superlative or (more precisely) an elative,[5] meaning "the entire enormous expanse of heaven" — contra Michel,[6] who sees in it a "relic of Babylonian ideas" (now theologically meaningless), "according to which several heavens, one above the other . . . were the dwelling places of various deities." The universal use of the plural represents the semantic phenomenon of a "plural of spatial extension."[7]

The basic meaning of the Common Semitic root — "heaven" (as both a cosmological and a religious term) — survived in practically all Semitic languages; it remains to the present day the primary meaning of the lexemes derived from this base. The occasional instances of figurative usage (e.g., "canopy" in Akkadian[8]) or pragmatic usage (e.g., "rain" in Akkadian and Arabic[9]), far from calling this meaning into question, in fact confirm it. All other (secondary) meanings can easily be derived from this basic meaning: the word for "heaven," the vault above the earth, the locus of stars, clouds, lightning, etc., but also the dwelling place of the gods, naturally can stand elliptically for the individual phenomena or figuratively for structurally similar phenomena (cf. the use of the term "heavens" for the canopy over the stage in Elizabethan theaters).

A different etymology, proposed in older works,[10] derives the noun from the relative pronoun *ša-* + *mayim*, "water," explaining the Hebrew lexeme as meaning "the place of water" or even — treating *ša-* as a causative prefix — "the source of rain."[11] This etymology has proved to be linguistically untenable,[12] not least because these explana-

---

1. G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. tr. Winona Lake, 1983), 214-15; P. Fronzaroli, *AANLR* VIII/20 (1965), 136, 140, 149; *HAL*, II, 1559.

2. *GK*, §88d; *VG*, I, 479.

3. JM, §91f; but see Meyer, II³, §58.18, who postulates a segholate formation. The vocalization of the Masoretes is also supported by the Hexapla: see E. Brönno, *Abhandlungen für die Kundes des Morgenlandes* 23 (1943) 183.

4. St.-B., III, 531-33.

5. *GK*, §133i; JM, §141l.

6. D. Michel, *BHHW*, III, 2162.

7. *VG*, II, 61; Michel, *Syntax*, 87-88; see also *GK*, §124b.

8. *AHw*, III, 1160.

9. Ibid.; *GaG*, §61h; F. Schwally, *TLZ* 24 (1899) 357.

10. *BLe*, §78v; *GesB*, 842; *KBL*², 986.

11. F. Hommel, *Süd-Arabische Chrestomathie* (1893), 19; T. K. Cheyne, *Sacred Books of the OT*, X (Baltimore, 1899), 157.

12. Von Rad, 502; Soggin, 1369.

tions are based primarily on the Hebrew evidence, ignoring the phonological data of the other Semitic languages. In the postbiblical period, popular etiologies and etymologies based on such passages as Gen. 1:1ff. and 1 K. 8:35 could interpret the lexeme in this sense. But this fact, like the notion of multiple heavens association with the use of the plural,[13] belongs to the realm of effective history: to use these phenomena for purposes of linguistic etymology is to misunderstand their nature.

Outside the OT and the Dead Sea Scrolls, the word occurs in almost all Semitic languages: Akk. *šamû/šamā'û*, also *šamāmû/šamāwû;*[14] Old Aram. and Imperial Aram. *šmyn;*[15] Old Can. *ša-mu-ma/ša-me-ma;*[16] Arab. *samā';*[17] OSA *smy;*[18] Eth. *samāy;*[19] Heb. *šmym;*[20] Jewish Aram. *šmyn/šmy'/šmyh;*[21] Mand. *šumia;*[22] Neo-Aram. *šmaiyā/šmō* (Maʿlula)/*šmāyo* (Turoyo);[23] Phoen. and Pun. *šmm;*[24] Sam. *šūmayyā;*[25] Syr. *šᵉmīn/šᵉmayyā';*[26] Tigre *sama'ĕ;*[27] Ugar. *šmm/šmyn.*[28]

2. *Distribution.* In the Hebrew portion of the OT (omitting Eccl. 1:13, where *haššāmayim* is usually emended to *haššemeš*[29]), *šāmayim* occurs 420 times; in the Aramaic portion, *šᵉmayyā'* occurs 38 times. "Heaven" (counting both *šāmayim* and *šᵉmayyā'*) is among the 120 most frequent words in the OT. If we consider only the substantive (ignoring the PNs), the 458 occurrences of "heaven" place it 40th in the frequency list. It accounts for some 0.15% of all the words in the OT (omitting the prefixed particles). It is clearly one of the terms that play a major role in the world of the OT.

When we turn to the distribution of occurrences in the books of the OT, we note immediately, despite the noun's great statistical importance summarized above, that it does not occur at all in six books: Numbers, Obadiah, Micah, Ruth, Song of Songs, and Esther. In the case of Obadiah, the brevity of the book probably accounts for the noun's absence. In the case of Ruth, Song of Songs, and Esther, its absence is probably due to

---

13. Cf. the rabbinic interpretation of 1 K. 8:27 in Midr. Ps. 114, §2.
14. *AHw*, III, 1160; *GaG*, §61h.
15. *DISO*, 308; *ATDA*, 173, 193-95.
16. EA 211:17; 264:16.
17. Wehr, 432.
18. Conti-Rossini, 197; Beeston, 128; cf. ibid., the theonym *d-SMWY.*
19. *LexLingAeth*, 341.
20. J. T. Milik, *RB* 60 (1953) 277.
21. *DISO*, 308.
22. *MdD*, 455.
23. F. Rosenthal, *An Aramaic Handbook. PLO* 10; 2 vols. in 4 parts (1967), II/2, 94, 118.
24. *DISO*, 308; *KAI* 4.3; 145 I.4 (?); 147.2 (?); Tomback, 322.
25. *HAL*, II, 1559.
26. *LexSyr*, 785-86.
27. *WbTigr*, 174.
28. The latter form only in *KTU* 1.19, IV, 24, 30; see J. Blau and S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 2 (1970) 29; M. J. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 357, no. 556d; *CML²*, 158; *PNU*, 194-95; *UT*, no. 2427; *WUS*, no. 2627; also *ša-mu-ma, Ugaritica* V (1968) 247, 13.
29. See *BHS*.

their secular subject matter as well as their brevity; and in the case of Numbers, to the secular perspective of the book.

The book of Micah, however, has a marked theological agenda and is closely related to Isaiah, where *šāmayim* occurs 10 times. The total absence of the word from Micah might be due to the theological purpose of the prophet: Micah of Moresheth, a native of Judah, looks upon Yahweh as a god who (re)acts directly in this world. Micah is concerned with Yahweh's imminent judgment and the secular transgressions of Samaria, Jerusalem, and Judah; for him, what takes place in heaven is irrelevant. The description of Yahweh as "God on high" (Mic. 6:6) does nothing to alter this observation.[30]

To all appearances, later redactors had no desire to question this tendency toward a secular theology: even in Mic. 1:3, where a kind of theophany has been interpolated that describes Yahweh as coming "out of his place" (which the reader schooled in form criticism will naturally locate in heaven[31]), the term "heaven" itself is avoided. Only Yahweh's holy temple (palace) is mentioned explicitly as his "place," and in Micah's time this temple stood on Mt. Zion.

A similar observation can be made with respect to the usage of the book of Amos — there is good reason for considering Amos, even more than Micah, a major exponent of a theology that focuses primarily on God's justice. The book of Amos does not eschew the word "heaven" entirely, and the redactors have assimilated the original message to the views of later periods more clearly than in the case of Micah. It is nevertheless surprising that in the nine chapters of the book there are only two mentions of *šāmayim:* just one in a text generally ascribed to Amos himself (Am. 9:2) and one in a hymnic addendum from the time of Josiah (9:6).[32] Furthermore, the prophet does not use the word positively or in theological speculation, but rather uses *šāmayim* in parallel with *šᵉ'ôl* to describe the utmost limits of Yahweh's power and the ineluctability of Yahweh's judgment. It was a later redaction, already fully under the influence of Dtr theology, that amplified description of limits to locate Yahweh's dwelling place in heaven.

Exactly the opposite situation obtains in the book of Daniel, in which — especially in the Aramaic portions — "heaven" is mentioned with surprising frequency. The 33 occurrences of the term here (5 of *šāmayim,* 28 of *šᵉmayyā'*) are proportionally the highest of any biblical book, making it roughly four times as frequent as the average for the other books of the OT. The texts of Joel and Haggai (3 times each), Zephaniah (2), and Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Malachi (1 each) are too short for the frequency of *šāmayim* to be statistically significant. If we ignore these short books, the Psalter, whose text is three times as long as that of Daniel, comes second, with only 74 occurrences (ca. 0.4% of the text), and this despite the frequent appearance of the "hymn" genre that would lead one to expect frequent use of *šāmayim.* In third place

30. See I.3.a below.

31. T. H. Robinson, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* 1/14 (³1964), 131; H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 56.

32. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 107, 112.

comes the book of Deuteronomy, with 44 occurrences (ca. 0.3% of the text); here the term is only about half as frequent as in Daniel.

If we do not limit ourselves to the demarcations of the canon but treat Isa. 40–66 as a distinct book, its 23 occurrences (ca. 0.3% of the text) place it before Deuteronomy. If we follow such scholars as Duhm in treating Isa. 40–55 alone as a separate unit, then Deutero-Isaiah (18 times; 0.4% of the text) comes second in the list, even before the Psalter.

Although the Psalter can hardly be dated since it probably comprises texts originating in very different periods, the purely statistical distribution of the term "heaven" allows us trace a kind of development in its usage, especially since the next places in the frequency list are all occupied by postexilic documents of the OT. Job uses *šāmayim* 23 times, Ezra uses *šāmayim* twice and *šᵉmayyā'* 8 times, Nehemiah uses *šāmayim* 14 times, and 2 Chronicles uses *šāmayim* 29 times (Soggin erroneously counts only 28[33]). Next comes Genesis, with 41 occurrences, a substantial portion of which belong to P and should therefore be dated in the exilic or postexilic period.

The conclusion is clear: in the early period heaven clearly played only a minor role in the thought of Israel. Only with Deuteronomy and the literature of the exilic period (Deutero-Isaiah) did heaven become an important object of theological interest. In the last book of the OT canon, it became virtually the focus of theological thought, where it has remained to the present century — reinforced in Christian circles by Mt. 6:9. Stade[34] had triggered a debate over whether Israel viewed Yahweh from the beginning as a god dwelling in heaven.[35] Von Rad's concluding generalization "that heaven could not be of central interest for the faith of Israel" in a sense brought this debate to an end at a higher level of abstraction.[36] His conclusion, however, must be qualified within the framework of an evolutionary model.

3. *Semantic Field.* Hebrew (like most other Semitic languages) has no terms directly synonymous with *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'*. It does, however, have a wealth of terms used in combination with "heaven," often in stereotyped expressions. We may distinguish three major groups: (a) expressions used figuratively as a substitute for or in parallel with "heaven," implicitly describing in greater detail the Israelites' understanding of "heaven"; (b) expressions appearing in construct phrases with "heaven," describing natural, cosmological, or religious phenomena or entities associated with heaven by the Israelites; and (c) antonyms of "heaven," used together with "heaven" to denote the cosmos as a whole or its utmost limits.[37]

a. Poetic texts in particular (2 S. 22:14,17//Ps. 18:14,17[13,16]; Jer. 51:53; Ps. 73:8-9; 102:20[19]; 144:5,7; 148:1; Job 16:19) often use *mārôm*, "height(s),"[38] instead of

33. P. 1369.

34. B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels,* I (Berlin, 1887), 446.

35. See Eichrodt, 186-87; Flügge.

36. P. 509.

37. J. Krašovec, *Der Merismus im Biblisch-hebräischen und Nordwestsemitischen. BietOr* 33 (1977), 11-25 and 25-26.

38. → רום *rûm* "be high," with additional references.

šāmayim; cf. also Isa. 24:18, where the phrase "windows of the heights" appears instead of the usual "windows of heaven" (cf. Gen. 7:11; 8:2; 2 K. 7:2,19; Mal. 3:10). This usage makes clear that Israel, too, located heaven high above the earth. Despite the frequent use of *mārôm* by itself in the sense of "heaven," it should not be called a "synonym";[39] this is clear from its use in many (other) passages where it refers to earthly "heights." In other words, in concrete language it is used as a genuine abstract noun, as its formation would also indicate; we are therefore not dealing with a "meaning" in the lexical sense but with the rhetorical figure of "abstract for concrete."[40]

Used relatively often in direct parallel with *šāmayim* we find the cosmological term → רקיע *rāqîaʿ*, "firmament" — 9 times in P's creation account (Gen. 1:6-20) and once (in synonymous parallelism) in Ps. 19:2(1). The term "heaven" is probably also implicit in Ps. 150:1 and Dnl. 12:3, which speak of the *rāqîaʿ*, but not in the case of Ezk. 1:22-26 and 10:1, which speak of an "expanse" over Yahweh's chariot throne.[41] The verbal root *rqʿ* qal, "stamp," from which the noun derives, is never used directly with reference to "heaven." It is used instead in Isa. 42:5; 44:24; Ps. 136:6 with reference to Yahweh's work in creating the earth; the parallel verbs used with reference to *šāmayim* are *bārāʾ*, *nāṭâ*, and *ʿāśâ*.

The third term deserving mention in this context is *ʾᵃgûḏâ*, a word that occurs only 4 times in the entire OT (the noun is derived from **ʾgd*, "bind together"; its basic meaning is "bundle"). Uniquely in Am. 9:6, as the context suggests, it means "vault (of heaven),"[42] the sense of interest here. (The LXX read *ʾaggāḏâ* and translated accordingly: *epangelía* in the sense of "religious instruction," as though Amos had suddenly shifted into Aramaic.) If the proposed meaning "vault" is correct and the use of the word in Ex. 12:22 is also taken into account, we may conclude that the Israelites could imagine the vault of heaven not only as a solid expanse *(rāqîaʿ)* but also as a kind of thatched roof made of reeds covering the earth, after the manner of Sumerian houses with their characteristic barrel-shaped roofs.

b. The most important words appearing in stereotyped phrases with "heaven" are *šemeš*, *yārēaḥ*, and *kôḵāḇ* (*mazzāl* instead in 2 K. 23:5), i.e., the technical terms for the sun, moon, and stars (or constellations of the zodiac) — cosmological phenomena that most civilizations associate with the realm of heaven. Especially common (10 times) is the combination *kôḵᵉḇê haššāmayim*. Except for this particular phrase, which always refers to the natural phenomenon of the starry heavens, it is remarkable how fluid is the OT transition from "cosmology" to "religion," domains that our modern sensibility keeps strictly separate. Although P makes every effort to depotentiate sun, moon, and stars to the status of *mᵉʾôrōṯ*, "lights," Dtn/Dtr texts such as Dt. 4:19; 17:3; 2 K. 17:16; 21:3 (par. 2 Ch. 33:3),5; 23:4,5; Jer. 8:2; 19:13; 33:22, as well as Isa. 34:4 (bis); 45:12; Zeph. 1:5; Dnl. 8:10; Neh. 9:6 (bis), and even P itself (Gen. 2:1) speak quite easily of these heavenly bodies as the *ṣᵉḇāʾ haššāmayim*, "host of heaven," or

39. Cf. *HAL*, I, 633.
40. W. A. van der Weiden, *VD* 44 (1966) 43-52.
41. Contra Soggin, 1369.
42. *HAL*, I, 10.

ṣᵉḇā' hammārôm, "host of the heights" (Isa. 24:21), treating them as beings rather than physical objects.

This conclusion is reinforced by the use of *ṣᵉḇā' haššāmayim* in 1 K. 22:19 (par. 2 Ch. 18:18), where the phrase clearly denotes beings that belong to Yahweh's heavenly court, as well as by Neh. 9:6, which speaks of the worship offered Yahweh by the host of heaven, by the stereotyped Dtn/Dtr criticism of cultic worship of the *ṣᵉḇā' haššāmayim,* and indirectly by Jgs. 5:20, where "the stars from heaven" fight against Sisera.

Other natural phenomena that the OT commonly speaks of in immediate conjunction with *šāmayim* are spatially somewhat "lower." These include the *'āḇîm, 'ᵃnānîm* (usually singular), and *šᵉḥāqîm,* "clouds," as well as their accompanying meteorological phenomena: *gešem* and *māṭār,* "rain"; *rᵉḇîḇîm,* "showers"; *šeleg,* "snow"; *ṭal,* "dew"; *kᵉpôr,* "hoarfrost"; *bārāḏ,* "hail"; *bārāq,* "lightning"; and *rûaḥ,* "wind."

The birds that fly through the air are also associated stereotypically with "heaven." The phrase *'ôp haššāmayim* occurs 38 times, *'ôp šᵉmayyā'* once, *ṣippôr šāmayim* once, and *ṣippôr šᵉmayyā'* twice. In short, more than half the occurrences of the Hebrew lexeme for our word "bird" (*'ôp* occurs 71 times in Hebrew and twice in Aramaic) and three additional occurrences of the onomatopoetic noun *ṣippôr* add the word "heaven" to describe the habitat of this genus.

Both these phenomena show that the term "heaven" in the OT can denote not only a theological and cosmological region but also a region that is spatially nearer — in the case of birds, the air above land and sea, for which Hebrew does not have a specific lexeme. Not until Middle Hebrew do we find the Greek loanword אֲוִיר.[43]

c. The most important word used as an antonym to "heaven" is the noun *'ereṣ* (Aram. *'arqā'* or *'ar'ā'*). We might limit our attention to the "pure" merism "heaven and earth" or "earth and heaven," determined or anarthrous, or also include passages where the lexemes "heaven" and "earth" are contrasted (e.g., 1 K. 8:27) and qualified by other nouns, but nevertheless have a clear semantic relationship (e.g., "the God of heaven and the God of earth" [Gen. 24:3]; "a new heaven and a new earth" [Isa. 65:17]), or appear separated for stylistic reasons by verbs or other elements in a parallel structure (e.g., Prov. 3:19), or even add "other" semantic combinations of the two terms, such as sequences like "heaven — earth — water under the earth" (e.g., Ex. 20:4//Dt. 5:8) and "heaven — earth — sea" (e.g., Ex. 20:11), or go so far as to include semantic combinations that are not clearly marked on the discourse level, such as the passages in the plague narrative where Moses stretches out his hand or staff toward heaven, after which something takes place on the earth (in Egypt) (Ex. 9:8,22,23; 10:21,22). Depending on our decision, there are between 34 and 180 explicit instances of this contrast between heaven and earth. In other words, in some 40% of all cases, the OT authors are not content to use the simple lexeme, but — intentionally or not — clarify their meaning by adding the antonymic term "earth" (always *'ereṣ,* never *'ᵃḏāmâ*).

There are two other antonyms to *šāmayim: tᵉhôm,* "deep" (Gen. 49:25; Dt. 33:13;

43. T. W. Rosmarin, *JBL* 51 (1932) 71-72.

Ps. 107:26; cf. Gen. 7:11; 8:2; Prov. 8:27), and *šᵉʼôl* (Am. 9:2; Ps. 139:8; Job 11:8; cf. Isa. 14:11-12,13-15). The terms *śāḏeh* and *yam*[44] appears only in extended sequences like "birds of heaven — animals of the field" or "birds of heaven — fish of the sea" and may be ignored in this context; the usage of the combinations in which they occur will be discussed later in this article.

II. OT.

1. *Cosmology.* Taking as our starting point the terms discussed in I.3 above, we can characterize the cosmology of the OT, or more precisely the role of heaven in the cosmology of ancient Israel, with relative ease. It must be noted, however, that the OT itself, apart from P's primal history and — within limits — Job 38–39, never attempts to summarize such a "cosmology" systematically. All we can attempt is a modern systematization based on the observed conceptuality.

The antonyms and parallels cited above demonstrate in the first instance that the cosmological notions of ancient Israel differed little from what we know of the cosmology of other ancient Near Eastern civilizations. The cosmos, in this view, consists of the distinct domains, one above the other: heaven, earth, and netherworld. The concrete instantiation of this three-story universe — at its simplest — involves at least two almost irreconcilable variants. Elements of both, however, occasionally appear in combination, most clearly in the (late?) postexilic Ps. 148[45] and the Chronicler.[46] In this sense, the oft-repeated warning against a final reconstruction of "the" OT cosmos — as developed by Pedersen,[47] is more than justified.[48]

a. The "classic" cosmology, originating in its fundamentals in Mesopotamia,[49] is summarized formulaically in Ex. 20:4//Dt. 5:8 and took on quasi-canonical authority through the influence of Gen. 1. In it, heaven is a solid vault (Ps. 19:2[1]), which keeps the waters of chaos above and beside it from invading the cosmos (Gen. 1:6-8; Ps. 148:4). To it are attached as lights the sun, moon, and stars (Gen. 1:14-17). It has openings through which the waters of chaos can once more invade the world during the deluge (Gen. 7:11; 8:2; cf. Isa. 24:18, which speaks of "openings of the heights"; 2 K. 7:2,[19], which Hertzberg erroneously mentions in the same breath,[50] has to do with hatches that Yahweh could make in heaven: there is no mention of any cloudburst). According to 2 S. 22:8 and Job 26:11, this enormous bell-shaped firmament rests on a foundation (pillars, analogous to the *išid šamē* of the Babylonians), as do the earth (Ps. 75:4[3]; 104:5; Job 9:6 [cf. 2 S. 22:8; Jer. 31:37; Job 38:6]) and the mountains (Ps. 18:8[7]).

44. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 356-57, no. 555.

45. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 563.

46. Weinberg, 221, who nevertheless finds a clear predominance of the "dwelling place" model.

47. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, 453-96.

48. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1957), 152.

49. See the Babylonian world map in Seybold, 178.

50. H. W. Hertzberg, *RGG*³, VI, 1615.

Since in this view heaven defines the outermost limit of the cosmos, some texts use the phrase *qᵉṣēh haššāmayim,* "end(s) of heaven," instead of "end(s) of the earth" (which is also found: Dt. 28:64; Jer. 10:13 = 51:16; Ps. 135:7; Job 28:24) when they want to describe the outermost limits of human habitation. For example, Dt. 30:4 and Neh. 1:9 declare that Yahweh will gather Israel even if the people are scattered to the end of heaven. In Dt. 4:32 repetition of the phrase emphasizes the extent of creation; in Isa. 13:5 it is used to describe the homeland of the most distant nations that Yahweh summons to punish Babylon. Drawing on general knowledge of the earth's geography, other texts speak of the four ends (NRSV "quarters") of heaven — equivalent to the four winds or the points of the compass — to describe the extent of the inhabited world (Jer. 49:36). In similar contexts Zec. 2:10(6); Dnl. 7:2; 8:8; 11:4 speak of the four "winds of heaven," which even appear personified in the form of chariots in Zec. 6:5.

According to Job 26:13, the primary function of the wind — the *rûaḥ* of Gen. 1:2 — was to sweep heaven clean during the act of creation, in strict analogy to the Babylonian myth. The course of the sun, too, is delimited by the ends of heaven (Ps. 19:7[6] — here also plural). Therefore the sun moves through the midst of heaven, where it even stood still during the battle at Gibeon (Josh. 10:13). The same cosmology is also presupposed in Dt. 4:11, during the revelation at Horeb, where flames blaze up to the "heart" (= center) of heaven; in Job 22:14, where God walks along the edge of heaven; and finally in Jer. 31:37, in a simile contesting the ability of anyone to measure heaven above or explore the foundations of the earth.

In the midst of this three-story cosmos, according to this cosmology, stands the earth — i.e., the dry land and the sea, that portion of the waters of chaos "tamed" within the cosmos to play a positive role for the creatures inhabiting it (Gen. 1:9-10). Beneath the earth lies the *tᵉhôm,* the primal ocean (v. 7), which also surrounds everything (vv. 9ff.), so that the cosmos is represented as neither more nor less than a "watertight chamber" amid the waters of chaos, delimited by heaven and earth. This understanding implies the notion that the meteorological phenomenon of rain is also associated closely with the primal ocean, as well as springs on the surface of the earth: the openings in heaven and these springs link the cosmos with the primal ocean (cf. Gen. 8:2, where the fountains of the deep and the openings of heaven are closed, bringing an end of the rain from above and the incursion of water from below).

Thus the waters of chaos outside the cosmos can have a positive function, if only they do not invade the cosmos in an uncontrolled flood. This positive role is illustrated by Mal. 3:10, the only passage that speaks of the openings built into heaven in a positive sense, as well as by such passages as Gen. 49:25 and Dt. 33:13.[51] The latter texts, from the Blessing of Jacob and the Blessing of Moses, speak of the blessings/gifts of the heaven above the *tᵉhôm* "that lies beneath," presumably the growth of vegetation promoted by rain and springs.

If a desire for systematization should lead one to include *šᵉ'ôl* in this picture, it would be located beneath the earth but probably above the primal ocean, not in or be-

51. See *BHS.*

neath the waters of chaos, as some assume, without citing specific evidence but probably utilizing Job 26:5-6, which is anything but clear.[52] The systematic presentations in Gen. 1 and Job 38–39 do not mention *šᵉʾôl;* "its position in the structure of the universe and in relation to the other parts of the world is unclear."[53]

Clearly the ancient Israelites themselves never defined the relationship between *tᵉhôm* and *šᵉʾôl,* not did they attempt to reconcile the different cosmologies in which these two terms originate. Ezk. 31:15, the only passage where both even appear in the same context, does not reflect on their spatial relationship. Job 38:16-17 does speak of *tᵉhôm* alongside the "gates of death" (which might be a substitute for "gates of *šᵉʾôl*"), but without locating either precisely. Hertzberg cites Am. 9:2-3 along with Jon. 2:3-4(2-3) (where *šᵉʾôl* is probably used figuratively) as evidence that *šᵉʾôl* is associated with "the depths of the sea";[54] but here *šᵉʾôl* is used antonymically to "heaven," while "the bottom of the sea" — only the bottom of the "tamed" portion of the primal ocean, not the unlimited *tᵉhôm* itself — appears in antithetical parallelism with the top of Carmel, together illustrating the scope of Yahweh's sway. In short, Am. 9:2-3 deals first with the cosmos as a whole, here defined by its extreme limits, *šāmayim* and *šᵉʾôl;* then it focuses on the earth as the portion of the cosmos set aside for human life, with its ultimate height and depth symbolized by the expressions "top of Carmel" and "bottom of the sea."[55]

Michel thinks instead of a highly specialized "duality" within what is ultimately the same tripartite cosmos.[56] According to him, the waters of chaos and *šᵉʾôl* simply represent two different "approaches" to one and the same phenomenon, the "netherworld." What determines the choice of one term or the other is whether the approach is "cosmogonic" or "functional": if the former, the passage uses *tᵉhôm,* the "primal ocean"; if the latter, *šᵉʾôl,* the "dwelling place of the dead." An analogous relationship links the apparently irreconcilable notions of "heaven" as both firmament and the dwelling place of God: depending on whether the argument of the text is cosmogonic or functional, heaven appears as *rāqîaʿ* or as a three-dimensional "world above." According to Michel, the same cosmology lies behind both. How his thesis might be reconciled with the functional role of *rāqîaʿ* in Gen. 1 Michel does not explain — "cosmogonic" and "functional" are not true antonyms. Neither does he discuss Am. 9:6, where the notion that Yahweh has built his "upper chambers" in heaven stands side by side with the statement that he has grounded the vault of heaven upon the earth.[57]

b. In all likelihood most texts that view heaven as the dwelling place of the deity or speak of *šᵉʾôl* rather than *tᵉhôm* reflect a different cosmology (earlier? originally Canaanite?), which can be reconstructed from texts such as Isa. 14:12-15; 38:10-20; Ezk. 32:17-32; Ps. 139:7-10; Job 11:7-10. In it (as in Gen. 2), the idea of a primal

52. E.g., G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1972), 180; Land and McDannell, 19.

53. Seybold, 184.

54. Hertzberg, *RGG*³, VI, 1616.

55. O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. tr. 1978, repr. Winona Lake, 1997), 23.

56. D. Michel, *BHHW,* III, 2162.

57. See I.3.a above.

ocean plays no role. Here *šāmayim* and *š^e'ôl* represent the outermost limits of the universe (as also in Job 11:8). In other words, all that is found beneath the earth is the realm of the dead, which can be thought of as analogous to a great city (e.g., Isa. 38:10). Heaven, above the earth, is not a solid vault holding back the waters of chaos, but an extensive space (insofar as it is not conceived purely abstractly in the late period as the sphere of God's sway, virtually identical with Yahweh). According to the Canaanite myth incorporated into Isa. 14:13, it is actually nothing other than the mountain of God in the far north. As Yahweh's dwelling place or the site of his palace (Ps. 11:4), heaven is normally inaccessible to mortals; in the case of Elijah, however, it can be reached with a chariot of fire (2 K. 2:1,11). These texts rule out any possibility of envisioning the heavenly palace of the deity as being surrounded by water. Most of the other comparable texts also lack any allusion to such a situation.

Two texts (Ps. 29 and 104) presuppose a close relationship between the dwelling place of Yahweh and the primal ocean. By scholarly consensus they both, at least at the core, characteristically originate outside Israel and thus represent a secondary aggregation of traditional elements (the same is true of the singular statement in Am. 9:6; there, however, the original text spoke only of the "upper chambers" built in heaven by Yahweh, and the mention of the sea is a secondary addition based on 5:8b[58]). Ps. 29 is generally thought to be a hymn to Baal modified to refer to Yahweh, into which elements of the El tradition have also been incorporated.[59] Ps. 104, however, is usually connected traditio-historically with the Sun Hymn of Akhenaton, with the possibility of Canaanite hymns as intermediaries.[60] Ultimately only v. 3 is clearly relevant: it speaks of Yahweh's "chambers" above the waters, in parallel with "heaven."

Ps. 29:10, by contrast, is linguistically much too difficult to be used as evidence for the cosmology of the psalmist, as is often done. The last word has not been spoken concerning the use of *l^e* before *mabbûl:* the argument of Begrich cited by many more recent scholars in support of the translation "Yahweh sits enthroned over the flood" is not convincing, for the parallels he cites would have Yahweh sitting *upon* the flood (a meaning also suggested by the frequently cited Ugaritic instances of *yšb l*).[61] Furthermore, it is methodologically dubious to base far-reaching hypotheses on a hapax legomenon, which *mabbûl* is in the sense of "flood." Finally, Ps. 29 contains no explicit reference to heaven. Possibly Yahweh's dwelling place is located there analogously to that of El (not Baal)[62] at the site of "the two rivers";[63] but it can hardly be identified with the dwelling place of the Mesopotamian god Ea.[64]

58. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 334-43; see also I.3.a above.

59. E.g., J. Jeremias, *Der Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987), 29-41.

60. E.g., Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 298-99.

61. J. Begrich, *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 49.

62. E. Otto, *VT* 30 (1980) 327; contra J. Jeremias.

63. *KTU* 1.3, V, 5-7.

64. As claimed by H. Gese, in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionem Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 98-99; see the survey in O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel* (Darmstadt, 1990), 66-67.

In any case, the generalization of Köhler (accepted by many others) that the OT located heaven "above the earth but beneath the firmament" is incorrect with respect to the combination of the two variant cosmologies.[65] It is also contradicted by Ezk. 1:22-23, should it be true that the *rāqîa'* there involves an allusion to the heavenly firmament.[66] Whoever thinks it possible or necessary to systematize all the OT statements about heaven must locate heaven as Yahweh's dwelling place above the primal ocean, with the firmament of heaven beneath it, and beneath that heaven as the air above the earth.

In this variant of the three-story universe, heaven as a rule is simply the realm of the deity, just as the earth is the realm of the living and *šᵉ'ôl* the realm of the dead. There are thus many texts that simply speak of heaven as the "dwelling place" of Yahweh, without any reference to the primal ocean. They call heaven the *mᵉqôm* (1 K. 8:30// 2 Ch. 6:21) or *mᵉḵôn* (1 K. 8:39,43,49//2 Ch. 6:30,33,39; Ps. 33:13-14) of Yahweh's dwelling, or the *mᵉ'ôn* of his holiness (Dt. 26:15; 2 Ch. 30:27), from which he hears the prayers of the Israelites or sees those who dwell on earth (Ps. 33:13-14) and from which he blesses Israel (Dt. 26:15). The same notion can also be articulated in concrete imagery, as when Ps. 11:4 and 103:19 say that Yahweh has (established) his throne in heaven (cf. also Ps. 33:13 and Job 26:5-14, the latter a difficult text in which the notion of God's heavenly dwelling place appears in combination with the Mesopotamian cosmology). In the case of Ps. 103, we also find the notion that heaven is infinitely high above the earth (v. 11, in the context of a simile).

In the late period heaven as a whole can be looked upon as Yahweh's throne and the earth as his footstool (Isa. 66:1). We also find the almost naive idea that Yahweh's heavenly palace has storerooms holding rain (Dt. 28:12), snow and hail (Job 38:22), and wind (Jer. 10:13 = 51:16; cf. Ps. 33:7; 135:7). In the latter instances, the notion of a storehouse is more figurative and is integrated into a more extensive description of meteorological phenomena from the perspective of the "classic" cosmology. Another combination of the dwelling place idea with the "classical" cosmology is found in Zec. 6:1, where it is usually assumed that the two mountains represent the gate of heaven, although the word "heaven" is not present.[67]

Somewhat ambiguous are certain texts in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 K. 8:32,34,36,45; passed over above) in which "heaven" follows the stereotyped petition "may you hear" without the normal prepositional or appositional qualification. This construction is grammatically possible, but appears odd in light of the theological weight of the text. That there is a problem here is shown by the text of Chronicles, which inserts a *min* in each case.[68] Possibly the Dtr author identified Yahweh with his dwelling place, so that alongside passages that refer to heaven as the dwelling place of Yahweh he consciously placed others that in a sense use "heaven" as

---

65. Köhler, *OT Theology,* 152.

66. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 122; but see I.3.a above.

67. Von Rad, 508; W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 123.

68. See below.

a term of address for Yahweh — a substitution that later became general practice, after the Jews shifted from Hebrew to Aramaic (Dnl. 4:23[26][69]) and in rabbinic Judaism.[70]

In the late period, therefore, it is not surprising to find Yahweh called the "King" or "Lord" of heaven (Dnl. 4:34[37]; 5:23). The latter title would hardly have been imaginable in the early period: the expression *ba'al šāmayim* would have brought to mind immediately the Baalshamem of the Canaanites.[71] But (earlier?) poetic texts can also state simply that Yahweh dwells in heaven (Ps. 2:4; 123:1) or that our God (Ps. 115:3) is Yahweh (Job 16:19) or (a) God (Ps. 73:25; Eccl. 5:1[2]; Lam. 3:41; Dnl. 2:28) in heaven — language understood as referring to his absolute ascendancy (Ps. 115:3; even more clearly in Isa. 55:9, where the distance of the earth from heaven symbolizes the distance of humans from God). No mortal can ascend so high (Prov. 30:4). On the other hand, Yahweh can "bow" heaven, i.e., bring his heavenly power to the aid of mortals, and come down from heaven (2 S. 22:10 = Ps. 18:10[9]; Ps. 144:5; cf. Gen. 11:5,7). Ps. 115:16 therefore argues that "heaven is Yahweh's heaven, but the earth he has given to human beings."

Yahweh therefore acts in heaven: he thunders (from) there (1 S. 2:10; 2 S. 22:14//Ps. 18:14[13]), there (and on earth) he works signs and wonders (Joel 3:3[2:30]; Dnl. 6:28[27]), there he rides (upon the clouds, from time immemorial) (Dt. 33:26; Ps. 68:34[33]; cf. Ps. 104:3b — leaving aside the question whether the expression "ancient heaven" in Ps. 68:34[33] is identical in meaning with "eternal heaven"[72]). Other activities of Yahweh or his angels, as when he calls from heaven, tacitly presuppose that he dwells in heaven (Gen. 21:17; 22:11,15; cf. Dnl. 4:28[31]). The same is true when Yahweh or God speaks from heaven (Ex. 20:22; Neh. 9:13), answers (Ps. 20:7[6]; with fire in 1 Ch. 21:26; cf. 1 K. 18:38), looks down (Isa. 63:15; Ps. 14:2; 33:13; 53:3[2]; 80:15[14]; 102:20[19]; Lam. 3:50), hears (Neh. 9:27,28; 2 Ch. 6:23,25,27,[73]30,35; 7:14), makes his voice heard (Dt. 4:36; Ps. 76:9[8]), or makes his word go forth (Isa. 55:10-11).

Therefore human beings turn toward heaven (Dt. 4:19; 1 K. 8:22,54//2 Ch. 6:13; 32:20) or look up to heaven (Dnl. 4:31[34]) when they want to reach the deity, although they can never reach God by their own power (Job 35:5). In 1 S. 5:12 and 2 Ch. 28:9, human cries rise up to heaven almost automatically. In a similar vein Deutero-Isaiah calls on his hearers to lift up their eyes to heaven (Isa. 51:6) — albeit what they are to see includes both positively the salvation and deliverance without end that comes from Yahweh above and negatively the passing away of heaven and earth, so that they are to

---

69. J. A. Montgomery, *Daniel. ICC* (1927), 242.

70. Jastrow, 1595.

71. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, 1968), 198-203; H. W. W. Drijvers, *Ba'al Shamîn, De Heer van de Hemel* (Assen, 1971); Gese, *Religionem,* 182-89 and passim; W. Röllig, *WbMyth,* I/1, 273; Eissfeldt; *KAI* 4.3; 26A.III.18. Cf. also the Old South Arabic tribal god of the *'amīr ḏū-samāwī* probably related to Baalshamem; see M. Höfner, *Religionem,* 250-54, 300-301, 376.

72. As assumed by *HAL,* II, 1561.

73. See *BHS.*

look at the earth as well. Not basically different are Ex. 9:22,23; 10:21,22; Dnl. 12:7, where Moses and the man clothed in linen lift their hands to heaven. This gesture makes immediate contact with the deity, whether God acts on earth through the agency of the extended hand or the hand lifted to swear an oath symbolically represents the immediate contact of the speaker with God. The latter notion is realized almost hypertrophically in Dt. 32:40, where Yahweh himself lifts his hand to heaven to swear.

Attributes of Yahweh are also localized in heaven or act from heaven. Yahweh's sword has drunk its fill in heaven (Isa. 34:5), his *dāḇār* is firmly fixed in heaven (Ps. 119:89), his *ḥeseḏ* is in heaven (Ps. 36:6[5]), his righteousness looks down from heaven (Ps. 85:12[11]). Fire comes down from heaven (2 Ch. 7:1) and a voice comes from heaven (Dnl. 4:28[31]); the psalmist prays that God will send from heaven (Ps. 57:4[3]) his steadfast love and faithfulness, which are established there (Ps. 89:3[2]). Remarkably in this context, the splendor of Israel (as God's own people?) is also localized in heaven, whence Yahweh has thrown it down to earth in anger (Lam. 2:1), although this language is probably figurative.

It is therefore almost reminiscent of NT incarnation theology when, in contrast to all these statements, Dt. 30:12 can say of Yahweh's commandment *(miṣwâ)* that what characterizes it is the fact that it is not in heaven: Israel does not need to ask, "Who will go up to heaven for us, and get it for us so that we may hear it and observe it?"

In conjunction with the notion of heaven as Yahweh's dwelling place, we must also examine Jgs. 13:20, where the *mal'aḵ-yhwh* ascends to heaven in the flame of Manoah's burnt offering, and Gen. 28:12,17, where Jacob sees a ladder going up to heaven on which angels of God are ascending and descending; seeing this ladder, he realizes that he must have spent the night before the gate of heaven (i.e., the gate of the heavenly palace). Ps. 78:23 probably belongs here as well; it says that Yahweh opened the doors of heaven and rained manna down from the clouds, language that implies the notion of a building. Probably also relevant is Jgs. 5:4//Ps. 68:9(8), which says in the context of a theophany that the earth quaked and heaven poured down water when Yahweh went forth.

In the story of the tower of Babel, however, it is not immediately clear whether the people build their tower to storm Yahweh's heaven (or heavenly palace) or merely seek to extend their power to the utmost limit of the cosmos (Gen. 11:4). Yahweh's reaction makes the latter assumption more likely. A similar image lies behind Job 20:6 (although here the action is limited to the wicked), Dt. 1:28 and 9:1, which speak of cities "fortified up to heaven," and Dnl. 4:8,17,19(11,20,22), where Nebuchadnezzar sees the tree that represents him growing until its top reaches heaven. Jer. 51:53 uses similar language of Babylon in a contrary-to-fact mode — probably in deliberate contrast to the statement in v. 9 that Babylon's judgment has reached up to heaven, even to the clouds (cf. Ezr. 9:6, which describes Israel's iniquities in the same terms). The same image occurs again in Ps. 73:9, which describes verbal attacks of the wicked against heaven (= God?).

The Song of Deborah says rather naively (using figurative language) that the stars of heaven fought against Sisera (Jgs. 5:20); but it is not just early texts that betray an awareness that heaven is not reserved to Yahweh alone: for example, Jeremiah

polemicizes repeatedly against the cult of the "queen of heaven" (Jer. 7:18; 44:17,18,19,25).[74] A whole series of texts speak of the countless (Jer. 33:22) "host of heaven," which attend Yahweh (1 K. 22:19//2 Ch. 18:18; Neh. 9:6) or praise him from heaven (Ps. 148:1-2 — the subsequent text [vv. 3-4] makes clear that this "host" includes sun, moon, and stars, and indeed the "heavens of heaven"); they were created by God/Yahweh (Gen. 2:1; Isa. 45:12; Ps. 33:6; Neh. 9:6) and therefore can also pass away (Isa. 34:4). The heavenly host have their own independent existence but are not Yahweh's equals (cf. Job 15:15, where the pregnant expression "heaven" refers not to God but to the heavenly beings[75]): he can do what he wills with the host of heaven (Dnl. 4:32[35]).

That Israel retained such polytheistic notions well into the late period is shown by the stereotyped Dtn/Dtr and prophetic attacks on the cult of the host of heaven (Dt. 4:19; 17:3 [= 11QT 55:18]; 2 K. 17:16; 21:3,5//2 Ch. 33:3,5; 2 K. 23:5; Jer. 8:2; 19:13; Zeph. 1:5). They spare only Josiah, who commanded that the vessels for the cult of the host of heaven, including Baal and Asherah, be burned (2 K. 23:4; cf. Ex. 20:4//Dt. 5:8, where not only images of the astral gods but also images of creatures on or under the earth appear as a potential threat to the monolatry demanded by Yahweh[76]). The demand in Jer. 10:2 not to be dismayed at the "signs" of heaven as the *gôyim* are clearly recalls the astral gods of the Babylonians.

One text even describes an earthly ruler — the "horn" of Dnl. 8:10-11 — as growing high as the host of heaven and defeating some of this host: the easy transition to ideas from Greek mythology is obvious.[77]

Finally, Isa. 14:12-15 must also be viewed against this background. Here the king of Babylon is likened to Helel ben Shachar[78] of Canaanite mythology,[79] fallen from heaven. He sought to achieve divine power by setting up his throne in heaven above the stars of El, thus making himself the equal of (El) Elyon — but was instead brought down to *še'ôl*.

The dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Dnl. 4:10,20[13,23]), by contrast, speaks positively of a watcher, a single member of the host of heaven, who is commissioned by Yahweh to descend from heaven to cut down the enormous tree that symbolizes King Nebuchadnezzar in his dream. This watcher and the "son of man" figure coming with the clouds of heaven (7:13) — however disputed the interpretation of the latter still may be[80] — are in any case among the positively qualified figures of the heavenly sphere.

Once Israel had localized the actual domain of its God more upon the earth, the notion that Yahweh dwells in heaven came to appear in combination with this earlier

---

74. J. T. Milik, *Bibl* 48 (1967) 557-64; M. Weinfeld, *UF* 4 (1972) 133-54.

75. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 271.

76. See I.3.b above.

77. R. Bartelmus, *Heroentum in Israel und seiner Umwelt. ATANT* 65 (1979).

78. → שחר *šaḥar.*

79. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 62-68.

80. See von Rad, 508-9; O. Plöger, *Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 121-22; R. Marlow, *CBQ* 28 (1966) 20-30.

theologoumenon in the formulaic expression "in heaven and on earth," which undoubtedly represents an OT precursor of the later doctrine of divine omnipresence — the merism stands, as it were, for "everywhere." It is expanded in Dt. 4:39 and Josh. 2:11: "Yahweh (your God) is God in heaven above and on earth below," and again in 1 K. 8:23//2 Ch. 6:14, here clothed in the form of a negative existential proposition: "There is no God like you, in heaven or on earth," and as an abbreviated question in Dt. 3:24 (cf. Ps. 113:6). According to Ps. 148:13, it is God's glory that is above earth and heaven. Once each we also find — anticipating the doctrine of omnipotence — the parallelism "Are you not God in heaven and ruler over all the kingdoms of the nations?" (2 Ch. 20:6), the statement that everything in heaven and on earth belongs to Yahweh (1 Ch. 29:11), and the predication "Whatever he pleases he does, in heaven and on earth, in the seas and all deeps" (Ps. 135:6), almost pedantically including the entire cosmos.

Ps. 139:8 goes even further: the psalmist starts from the assumption that Yahweh's sway extends from heaven to *š*e*'ôl.* The same idea is expressed in such ejaculations as "Be exalted, O God, above heaven, let your glory be over all the earth" (57:6,12[5,11]; 108:6[5]) — further heightened in both psalms by the association of God's attributes "steadfast love and faithfulness" with heaven and the clouds (57:11[10]; 108:5[4]: "higher than"; cf. also 113:4 with respect to Yahweh's *kāḇôḏ*). In the light of such language, it is theologically consistent for 89:12(11) to take the further step and declare, "Heaven is yours, the earth also is yours," and for Dt. 10:14 to say, "Heaven and the heaven of heavens, the earth with all that is in it, belong to Yahweh, your God." Note also how the dwelling-place language in Solomon's prayer of dedication cited above (1 K. 8) is relativized in advance by the statement "The heaven of heavens cannot contain you" (v. 27//2 Ch. 6:18; cf. also 2 Ch. 2:5[6]).[81]

The idea that Yahweh dwells in heaven probably made it easy for Israel to borrow the Aramaic formula *'*e*lāh š*e*mayyā'* ("God of heaven"), which reflects the religious background of the Persian Empire, as a substitute for the divine name (Dnl. 2:18,19,37,44; Ezr. 5:12; 6:9,10; 7:12,21,23;[82] Hebrew: Neh. 1:4; 2:4,20; once [Ezr. 5:11] in the expanded form "God of heaven and earth"). This change was also helped by the fact that some passages (Ps. 115:16; Lam. 3:66) had previously treated heaven as Yahweh's proper domain (Ps. 115:16; Lam. 3:66).[83] To guarantee that the phrase refers to no other god than Yahweh, at the beginning of the books of Ezra (1:2) and Nehemiah (1:5) and at the end of Chronicles (2 Ch. 36:23), it is placed (in Hebrew translation) in explicit apposition to the name of the Jewish God. It appears similarly in Ps. 136:26 at the end of a thanksgiving liturgy praising Yahweh's acts of deliverance and, probably with apologetic intent, in Jon. 1:9. It also occurs in Gen. 24:7 and — in the expanded form "Yahweh, the God of heaven and earth" — in Gen. 24:3, i.e., in a narrative relatively earlier than the other texts.

81. On the elative formation see I.1 above.
82. See also *AP* 30.2, etc.
83. Eissfeldt, 27-31.

Mention of this last passage in conjunction with Jon. 1:9 also signals a transition to the second great thematic complex in which the term "heaven" appears to be redundant, namely, the creation texts. In his words to the sailors, Jonah not only confesses Yahweh as the "God of heaven" but also describes him (alluding to Gen. 1?) as the one "who made the sea and the dry land."

2. *Heaven and Creation.* The reference to Jon. 1:9 confronts us with a critical religio-historical problem. Observant Jews and Christians familiar with Gen. 1 and the first article of the Creed usually do not see its seriousness immediately. The verse in Jonah describes Yahweh as creator of the earth, but not of heaven. In the background probably stands the fact that the Canaanite religion knew Baal as the "lord" of heaven, but did not speak of a creator of heaven or of the cosmos.[84] Rendtorff has discussed this situation in detail in his analysis of the summary title *'ēl 'elyôn qōnēh šāmayim wā'āreṣ.*[85]

The early stages of Yahwism borrowed features of the Canaanite high god El as well as of Baal, albeit not simultaneously nor in equal measure.[86] The religion of El was probably the source of the notion that Yahweh created the earth, as can be shown from the widely attested title *'l qn(h) 'rṣ*[87] and the name Elkunirsha, already known to the Hittites.[88] From the Baal cult came the view of Yahweh as the "lord of heaven," although the actual title was eschewed initially.[89] The idea that heaven was created as a firmament above the earth to contain the waters of chaos and that one and the same God created heaven and earth, i.e., the cosmos, most likely did not carry the day until Israel became more deeply knowledgeable about Mesopotamian cosmogony — probably not until the exilic period.

The influence of Egyptian ideas concerning the creation of the world (e.g., a myth recorded in Ramesside papyri in which Re refers to himself as creator of heaven and earth[90]) may be assessed as relatively minor, for texts that contain more than formulaic expressions like "creator of heaven and earth" always enshrine the Mesopotamian cosmology. It is not out of the question, however, that Canaanite and Egyptian ideas coalesced, at least in clearly composite formulas like Gen. 14:19,22, the more so since ancient Jerusalem cult traditions may lie behind Gen. 14.[91] In the early period, furthermore, Jerusalem lay well within the Egyptian sphere of influence. As a consequence, formulas that speak of the creation of heaven and earth, etc., are helpful for dating texts only when the cosmology behind them is recognizable.

---

84. Contra J. C. de Moor, "El, the Creator," in G. Rendsburg et al., eds., *Bible World. FS C. H. Gordon* (New York, 1980), 171-87; idem, *Nisaba* 16 (1987) 15 n. 81.

85. Rendtorff, *GSAT,* 172-87, disputing F. M. Cross, *HTR* 55 (1962) 225-59.

86. For a summary of recent discussion, see Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel,* 152-59.

87. E.g., *KAI* 26A.III.18-19.

88. H. Otten, *MIO,* I (1953), 125-50.

89. See II.1 above.

90. H. Brunner, in W. Beyerlin, ed., *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the OT. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1978), 5-6.

91. E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 461-64 n. 5.

A thorough survey of the passages in which heaven appears as the object of God's creative act largely confirms this thesis. It is noteworthy that a simple statement of the type "Yahweh/God created heaven" appears only 3 times (actually only twice, since one instance involves identical texts): Ps. 96:5 = 1 Ch. 16:26 and Ps. 33:6 (in the latter expanded by the addition of the "host of heaven") — i.e., in late texts.[92] In Ps. 96:5 = 1 Ch. 16:26, furthermore, the statement clearly has a polemical and apologetic purpose: "The other gods are ciphers, but Yahweh made heaven."

In all other texts having to do with the creation process, "heaven" appears in parallel with other (logical) objects, most frequently "earth." Sometimes the text uses the "pure" merism "heaven and earth" (16 times) or "earth and heaven" (once, in Gen. 2:4b, introducing the "Yahwistic" [?] creation story, in which only the earth plays a role — "heaven" seems to have been added here only to make v. 4b parallel with v. 4a). Other texts construct the two objects with different verbs (14 times), use alongside "heaven" an object other than "earth" (3 times), or expand the sequence by adding further elements for the sake of completeness (11 times). In the first two cases and in the sequences aiming at completeness, we have already noted that the focus is usually not on the specific individual elements such as "heaven" and "earth": the merism or sequence stands for "everything," the totality of the cosmos.

We may note in this context that such sequences meant to comprehend "everything" never mention *šᵉ'ôl* — evidence supporting the assumption that, as a rule, creation texts and formulas presuppose "classical" Mesopotamian cosmology. In the latter, *tᵉhôm* certainly appears (cf. Gen. 1:2), albeit never as something created, but always as something already present at the act of creation. Only once, moreover, does heaven as Yahweh's dwelling place appear in the sequence of works of creation (Ps. 104:2 — clearly a hybrid of different traditions[93]) — further evidence that creation accounts are associated primarily with the concrete heaven of "classical" Mesopotamian cosmology. The OT authors clearly had some sense that ultimately the heaven in which Yahweh/God dwells, heaven as the sphere of divine power virtually identical with the deity, must by its very nature be as *agénnētos* as the deity.

The verbal roots (including their derivatives) referring to the creation of heaven are: → **ברא** *bārā'*, "create" (Gen. 1:1; 2:4a; Isa. 42:5; 45:18; 65:17), → **טפח** *ṭāpaḥ*, "spread out" (Isa. 48:13), → **יסד** *yāsaḏ*, "establish" (Ps. 89:12[11]), → **כון** *kûn* polel and hiphil, "make firm" (Prov. 3:19; 8:27), → **כלה** *kālâ*, "finish" (Gen. 2:1), → **נטה** *nāṭâ*, "spread out" (Isa. 40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13,16;[94] Jer. 10:12 = 51:15; Zec. 12:1; Ps. 104:2; Job 9:8), → **עשה** *'āśâ* (Aram. **עבד** *'ᵃḇaḏ*), "make" (Gen. 2:4b; Ex. 20:11; 31:17; 2 K. 19:15 = Isa. 37:16; [Isa. 44:24]; Isa. 66:22; Jer. 10:11; 32:17; Ps. 8:4[3]; 33:6; 102:26[25]; 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136:4; 146:6; 2 Ch. 2:11), → **קנה** *qānâ*, "create" (Gen. 14:19,22), and → **תכן** *tāḵan* piel, "mark off" (Isa. 40:12). About half of all these texts involve *'āśâ* (21 times)/*'ᵃḇaḏ* (once); almost all — the only exceptions being

92. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 375; idem, *Psalms 60–150*, 251-52.

93. See II.1 above.

94. See *BHS*.

in Gen. 1:1–2:4 and Job 9:8 — have or presuppose Yahweh as the logical subject. Jer. 10:11 is only apparently an exception: there we find the statement, "The gods who did not make heaven and earth must perish from the earth and from under heaven"; but it is negative and stands in contrast to the positive statement in v. 12, where Yahweh is the subject.

It is also noteworthy that the active participle of the verb selected appears in a disproportionately large number of these passages (20), in most cases in apposition with Yahweh, who is thus qualified formulaically as "maker" or "creator" of heaven and earth or "extender" of heaven (also "establisher/shaper/maker" of the earth, etc.). In addition, most verbal clauses that mention the creation of "heaven and earth," etc., are of formulaic brevity. This language can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as summarizing the belief learned from Deutero-Isaiah and P's creation account: the most extensive arguments and narratives dealing with creation appear in these two sources, while those formulaic summaries that can be dated with some assurance (Ex. 20:11; 31:17; Zec. 12:1; Neh. 9:6; 2 Ch. 2:11) are later. This observation permits us to draw conclusions concerning the remaining formulaic constructions (including Ps. 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136:5; also Ps. 8:4[3] and 102:26[25]).[95] Only in the case of Gen. 14:19,22; Ps. 104:2; Job 9:8; Prov. 8:27 is it not impossible that earlier traditions, possibly reflecting Egyptian ideas, may have been incorporated. Otherwise all the statements that Yahweh/God made or created "heaven and earth" point to the exilic or postexilic period and presuppose the Mesopotamian idea of heaven — except for Gen. 1:1–2:4, where the formula that God created (*bārā'* qal) heaven and earth (= everything) and the statement that heaven and earth were created (*bārā'* niphal) bracket the text. The Mesopotamian cosmology is especially clear in Deutero-Isaiah's use of *nāṭâ:* the heaven that can be stretched out like a curtain over the earth (Isa. 40:22), the firmament to which the sun, moon, and stars are attached as lights (Gen. 1:15,17) — these are not the heaven where Yahweh dwells.

The latter, furthermore, is not a heaven brought into being by an act of generation, as one might expect at first glance from the *tôlᵉḏôṯ* formula at the end of P's creation account (Gen. 2:4a). The placement of this formula after the account of God's creative words and acts — in Hebrew texts what has already been said always constrains what follows — it is clear that P deliberately wanted to exclude this idea, current among Israel's neighbors. In addition, of course, the formula establishes a link with the subsequent genealogies in Genesis.

Finally, both major sources containing universal statements about creation share (among other things) a clear polemical and apologetic purpose for saying that Yahweh/God made heaven and earth. This statement attacks the claims of the religion of the Babylonian conquerors. Although the Babylonians have won a political victory, it is Yahweh — not Marduk — who made everything; Yahweh alone, therefore, is responsible for the present and future fate of his people, indeed of the whole

95. See W. Richter, in L. Scheffcyzk et al., eds., *Wahrheit und Verkundigung. FS M. Schmaus,* I (Paderborn, 1967), 175-212, for a thorough discussion of the problem of formulaic summaries.

world. It is he who has set his glory in heaven in the form of sun, moon, and stars (Ps. 8:2,4[1,3]).

In the other texts where heaven is the object of Yahweh's action (or the subject in passive constructions), it is not always clear what notion of heaven is presupposed; frequently, though, it is the Mesopotamian cosmology or a combination of the two cosmologies already discussed.[96] The former is certainly the case in Lev. 26:19, where Yahweh threatens to make heaven like iron over Israel and the earth like copper (cf. Dt. 28:23) if Israel departs from his ways. The same is true in passages like Isa. 13:13; Hag. 2:6,21 (cf. also Joel 2:10; 4:16[3:16]), which speak of the shaking of heaven and earth on the day of Yahweh — to which is added in Isa. 13 and Joel the notion that the heavenly bodies will lose their light (Isa. 13:10; Joel 2:10; 4:15[3:15]). It is particularly true for Jer. 4:23, where the prophet sees the earth waste and void and the heavens darkened, which means nothing less than a reversal of the act of creation in Gen. 1. It is almost equally true in Isa. 51:6 and 34:4: the former says that heaven and earth will pass away, along with those who live in them; the latter says that the host of heaven will vanish and heaven will be rolled up like a scroll. In Ezk. 32:7-8 the prophet announces that, after the death of Pharaoh, Yahweh will cover heaven, make its stars dark, cover the sun with a cloud, and prevent the moon from giving its light. In Isa. 50:3 Yahweh declares that as a sign of his power he will clothe heaven with blackness and shroud it in mourning. These two passages probably also belong here.

Clearly most of these passages — above all Jer. 4:23 — reflect the idea that the created world is temporally finite. It therefore makes sense to find in Dt. 11:21; Ps. 89:30(29); Job 14:12[97] statements that express the duration of the present age in terms of the "days" or "duration" of heaven (cf. "days of the earth" in Gen. 8:22). This language leads easily to the idea that Yahweh will one day create a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. 65:17; 66:22). That Dt. 11:21 and Ps. 89:30(29) speak of heaven as "the essence of [relative] durability" is not a contradiction.[98] The contexts concern finite situations that are normally impermanent: the speakers wish that the people of Israel and the Davidic line may endure as long as the days of heaven. It is therefore clear that Gen. 9:11, which is often misunderstood as guaranteeing the unaltered continuance of this cosmos for all time under the Noachian covenant, is to be taken — at least in the framework of a biblical theology, and probably already in the framework of P — only in its literal sense: another deluge is precluded, but not an end of this world. The text was also understood in this sense in later Judaism (Mekilta on Ex. 20:2).[99]

We have postulated a fundamental difference between "heaven" as a created entity, as in the Mesopotamian cosmology, and "heaven" as the dwelling place or domain of the deity. The historical evidence not only suggests but requires this distinction, even though the texts themselves are not always totally consistent in maintaining it. Here we

---

96. See II.1 above.
97. Cf. *KAI* 266.3.
98. Soggin, 1371.
99. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin, *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael* (Jerusalem, 1960), 221.

disagree completely with Westermann,[100] who disputes this very point: for the OT, the notion that heaven is "simply something created" is a petitio principii that generalizes the theology of P.

The situation is less clear with respect to the background cosmology in the texts that speak of Yahweh's shutting or opening of heaven in order to withhold or send rain (Dt. 11:17; 28:12; 1 K. 8:35 = 2 Ch. 6:26; 2 Ch. 7:13 — expanded apologetically in Jer. 14:22). At least Dt. 28:12 (cf. Ps. 78:23) presupposes the notion of a heavenly storehouse rather than openings in heaven (or should the text be understood against the background of Ps. 33:7, where the storehouse contains the *tᵉhômôṯ*?). That the opening or even rending of heaven refers primarily to heaven as God's dwelling place is shown by Ezk. 1:1 and Isa. 63:19(64:1), even though it is not impossible that the latter text alludes to the *rāqîaʿ* conception.[101] And when prophets say that Yahweh or his praise fills heaven and earth, they probably are thinking of his dwelling place.

Quite peculiar (albeit not unparalleled), however, is the notion of heaven and earth as personally acting subjects. In Ps. 50:4, for example, Yahweh summons heaven and earth to judgment upon his people — obviously because (as is articulated more clearly in Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28) they are to appear as witnesses against Israel.[102] Similar language, with other verbs, is used in Isa. 1:2 and Job 20:27 with reference to the wicked, while in Dt. 32:1 it is Moses who calls on heaven and earth to hear — in this case a positive message. The same idea is presupposed in Jer. 2:12, where heaven is called upon to be appalled at the sin of Israel; in Jer. 4:28, where earth and heaven mourn Yahweh's punitive judgment; and in Hos. 2:23-24(21-22), where the prophet even establishes an "information chain": "On that day I will answer, says Yahweh, I will answer heaven, and it [LXX heaven] shall answer the earth, and the earth shall answer grain, wine, and oil, and they shall answer Jezreel." Certainly the series in Hosea is meant figuratively. But behind it lie ancient polytheistic notions, as we see from an Aramaic inscription from Sefire (ca. 750 B.C.E.) that lists a lengthy series of witness, beginning with El and Elyan, followed by heaven and earth, then the depths of the sea, springs, day, and night.[103] This notion probably goes back to the invocation of gods in ancient Near Eastern treaties (esp. Hittite).[104]

Heaven also appears as an active subject in several of the Psalms, Deutero-Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In the Psalter "the heavens" declare God's glory (Ps. 19:2[1]) or righteousness (50:6; 97:6); heaven (and earth) are to praise Yahweh (89:6[5]; [69:35]; cf. 148:4) or rejoice (96:11//1 Ch. 16:31). In Deutero-Isaiah they are called on to sing with joy to celebrate the mighty acts of Yahweh (Isa. 44:23; 49:13) and are commanded, "Shower, O heavens, from above, and let the skies rain down righteousness; let the

---

100. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 119, in disagreement with G. Gloege, *RGG*³, III, 332.

101. Soggin, 1370, citing F. Lentzen-Deis, *Bibl* 50 (1969) 301-27.

102. J. A. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre. BietOr* 19 (1967), 13-14, 38.

103. *KAI* 222A.11,16; 222B.7; *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, 203-4.

104. G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh, 1955), 34; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 9-10.

earth open and bring forth salvation, and let it cause righteousness to sprout up also" (45:8). Jeremiah even says that heaven and earth will shout for joy over the destruction of Babylon (Jer. 51:48). It is impossible in each instance to determine whether and to what extent heaven and earth are conceived as real persons, or whether we are dealing with figurative usage, a further development of the polytheistic tendencies previously noted.[105]

In a context similar to Isa. 45:8, heaven appears as a grammatical object in Ps. 147:8, which says that Yahweh covers heaven with clouds and prepares rain for the earth. This passage also provides a kind of bridge to the use of the term in something like the modern sense of "sky."

3. *The Heavens.* This heaven is as "clear" as a sapphire (Ex. 24:10). It seems unlikely that this text refers to cultic purity;[106] it likens heaven to a gemstone rather than treating it as the dwelling place of God. That sun, moon, and stars stand or shine in the "heavens" or "sky" is a common image from the time of the OT down to the present (cf. Dt. 4:19). Here *šāmayim* is simply synonymous with what lies above when perceived from the perspective of the earth. This is quite clear from the stereotyped expression "the stars of heaven,"[107] used — without any reference to a particular cosmology — to suggest inconceivably large numbers. It appears in the Pentateuch's promises of increase (Gen. 15:5; 22:17; 26:4; Ex. 32:13) as well as in texts that cite the fulfillment of these promises (Dt. 1:10; 10:22; Neh. 9:23; 1 Ch. 27:23) or (potentially) rescind them (Dt. 28:62). Other texts such as Nah. 3:16, however, also use this simile, in one case (Jer. 33:22) substituting "the host of heaven."[108]

Those who gaze at the stars — astrologers — divide the heavens into specific zones (Isa. 47:13).[109] To observe heavenly phenomena, one must look *šāmaymâ,* "heavenward, up." In Job 22:12 this activity helps the viewer perceive the greatness of God; but the ordinances of the heavens (astronomical laws) are ultimately concealed from mortals (Job 38:33); cf. Jer. 33:25-26, where the ordinances governing the course of the heavenly bodies parallel the promises concerning Jacob and David.

The expression "heavenward, into the air" without mention of specific phenomena appears in Ex. 9:8,10; Josh. 8:20; Jgs. 20:40; Ps. 107:26; Job 2:12, where it is largely desemanticized, meaning simply "up(ward)." Whether Moses and Aaron throw the soot into the air to bring it closer to Yahweh is not stated by Ex. 9:8,10; neither is it clear in Job 2:12 whether the ritual of throwing dust on one's head has anything to do with God. Elsewhere such a theological implication is largely out of the question; for smoke (Josh. 8:20) and flames (Jgs. 20:40) rise "heavenward" in accordance with the

105. See II.1.b above.

106. Soggin, 1371.

107. See I.3.b above.

108. See II.1 above.

109. *HAL,* I, 237, contra *HAL,* II, 1561; J. Blau, *VT* 7 (1957) 183-84; H.-P. Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971. SVT* 22 (1972), 273, who translate *hbr* as "worship."

laws of physics, and Ps. 107:26 uses the expression in figurative hyperbole to describe the waves of the sea. In Prov. 25:3 the "heavens" simply suggest height; the merism "the heavens and the earth" describes the uttermost limits of human perception.

That the use of *šāmayim* in conjunction with meteorological phenomena generally presupposes this last understanding of the word is obvious, whether the text speaks of the "dew of heaven" (Gen. 27:28,39; Dt. 33:13,28; Zec. 8:12; Dnl. 4:12,20,22,30 [15,23,25,33]; 5:21; negated: Hag. 1:10), rain and snow (Isa. 55:10), or rain (clouds) (Dt. 11:11; 2 S. 21:10; 1 K. 18:45; Jer. 10:13 = 51:16; Ps. 78:23; 147:8; Job 38:37), frost (Job 38:29), or wind (Ps. 78:26). Of course this meaning does not rule out the possibility that God is the author of these natural phenomena, as is suggested by the observation that the active subject or (indirect) addressee is usually Yahweh. The latter observation is true particularly in those cases where objects "rain" (i.e., fall) from heaven that are not usually present there, e.g., "bread from heaven" or manna (and flesh) (Ex. 16:4; Ps. 78:24-28; Neh. 9:15; similarly Ps. 105:40), sulfur and fire (Gen. 19:24), powder and dust (Dt. 28:24), stones (Josh. 10:11), fire (2 K. 1:10,12,14; Job 1:16), or even righteousness (Isa. 45:8). The statement that Yahweh makes the thunder — his voice — resound under the whole heaven (Job 37:3) completes our catalog of texts referring to meteorological and related phenomena.

This brings us to the common idiom *(mit)taḥaṯ haššāmayim* (Aram. *tᵉḥôṯ šᵉmayyā'*), "under heaven," in which the catchword "heaven" usually refers to the region above the earth. Apart from the P texts, it is usually impossible to determine whether the texts in question think of heaven as *rāqîa'* or as the dwelling place of God. When the waters under heaven are gathered together in one place, when the flood is to destroy all flesh from under the heavens, and when all the high mountains under the whole heaven are covered with water (Gen. 1:9; 6:17; 7:19), the author is clearly drawing on the *rāqîa'* idea. The situation is different, however, when Yahweh announces that the remembrance of Amalek will be utterly blotted out from under heaven (Ex. 17:14; Dt. 25:19), when the names of foreign kings and nations, and Israelite renegades as well, will be blotted out from under heaven (Dt. 7:24; 9:14; 29:19), whereas the name of Israel will be preserved (2 K. 14:27), and when foreign gods or Israel's enemies are to be destroyed (Josh. 10:11; Lam. 3:66) or dread and fear of Israel come upon all the peoples under heaven (Dt. 2:25): here "under heaven" means simply the whole earth. This is true especially when *kōl* is inserted between the preposition and the noun, as when the text speaks of all peoples or kingdoms everywhere under heaven (Dt. 4:19; Dnl. 7:27) or something that has never before been done under the whole heaven (Dnl. 9:12), or when the construction appears in conjunction with the notion of God's omniscience or claim to sole authority (Job 28:24; 41:3). Qoheleth employs the idiom in the same way (but without *kōl*) when speaking of human life or purposes (Eccl. 2:3; 3:1; possibly also 1:13, if the text is not emended[110]).

On the other hand, the merism "in heaven above and on the earth beneath" stands for the entire cosmos, as we see from its use in Dt. 4:39; Josh. 2:11; 1 K. 8:23 — al-

110. See *BHS;* see I.2 above.

ways in conjunction with Yahweh's claim to omnipotence — and its expanded form (with "in the water under the earth") in the prohibition of images, where we recognize once more the "classic" cosmology (Ex. 20:4//Dt. 5:8).

The atmosphere, the region between heaven and earth (in the narrower sense), is referred to in constructions where the prep. *bên,* "between," appears in conjunction with heaven and earth. Natural or supernatural phenomena may be involved. Absalom is left hanging "in the air" with his hair caught in a tree; in this predicament he is easily "disposed of" by Joab (2 S. 18:9). Angels, however, have ready access to this domain, where they can move freely or even stand without incurring harm (Zec. 5:9; 1 Ch. 21:16). When seized by such an angel or by the *rûaḥ,* a mortal like the prophet Ezekiel can also experience the sensation of flight without danger (Ezk. 8:3), a form of movement otherwise restricted to the "birds of the air" (Gen. 1:20; cf. Prov. 23:5, where riches are compared to a flying eagle).

The "birds of the air" appear frequently in onomastica associated with creation accounts, where they generally stand in opposition to such expressions as the "beasts of the field," the "creatures of earth," and "cattle," or "fish in the sea," "creeping things," or even "human beings." The most comprehensive list of this sort occurs characteristically in the introduction to P's "dominion command" and in the command itself (Gen. 1:26,28). Shorter series appear in Gen. 1:30 (P) and 2:19,20 (commonly assigned to J), as well as in Ps. 8:9(8) and 104:12. Here too belong the corresponding series when creation is threatened by the flood (Gen. 6:7; 7:23) and delivered from the flood (Gen. 7:2-3; 9:2), as well as the passages where the existence of the natural world is imperiled by God's punitive judgment (Jer. 4:25; 9:9[10]; Ezk. 38:20; Hos. 4:3; Zeph. 1:3) or Yahweh makes a new covenant with his creatures following such judgment (Hos. 2:20[18]).

Striking in its length is the series in the prohibition of images in Dt. 4:16-18. The content of this series is quite similar to the creation account in Gen. 1 (man — woman — animals upon the earth — birds that fly in the air — things that creep on the ground — fish in the water under the earth; note, however, that this text substitutes *ṣippôr* for *'ôp* and a relative clause for the construct phrase). It is reasonable to assume that this text represents as complete as possible a catalog of the living beings created by God, so that the concerns reflected in the apologetic polemic of Gen. 1 are restated here in the form of a commandment. Also closely related to the theology of creation are the series in the book of Job where this expression occurs (Job 12:7-8; 28:21; 35:11). What Gen. 1–2 presents in narrative dress and Dt. 4:16-18 clothes in the form of a commandment is here used argumentatively in connection with the problem of theodicy.

Also related, if only distantly, is the merism "beasts of the field" and "birds of the air" in Dnl. 2:38; the point of the text is that Nebuchadnezzar has been granted power over all created beings by the hand of the king of heaven.

In the context of wisdom argumentation, individual species of birds are cited paradigmatically, e.g., the eagle and the heron in the sky. In the numerical proverb Prov. 30:19, the way of the eagle in the sky is joined with the way of the snake on the rock, the way of a ship on the high seas, and the way of a man with a girl: all represent the incomprehensible. In Jer. 8:7 the innate behavior of various species of birds is con-

trasted with the perverse behavior of Israel in turning aside from Yahweh. The eagle in the heavens appears again in Lam. 4:19 as a proverbially swift creature.

The meaning of Eccl. 10:20 is obscure: the birds of the air appear here as a kind of "secret service" informing the powerful. Possibly the text represents a sarcastic allusion to the mantic practice of augury; it is unnecessary to think immediately of the cranes of Ibycus. The image of Yahweh as a fowler in Hos. 7:12 is less sapiential than visual; it is not impossible, however, that the text is likening the Ephraimites/Israelites to airborne birds: their hubris has robbed them of the firm ground of reality under their feet.

The last and largest group of texts using the phrase "birds of the air" comprises those that speak of being left as prey for the birds of the air (and the animals or beasts of the field). This usage presumably reflects the general experience in the Near East that corpses of the slain are devoured as carrion (cf. 2 S. 21:10). Only once does this topos appear in a communal lament describing something that has already taken place (Ps. 79:2). All other occurrences are in threats or predictions, mostly of Dtr origin.

Several subgroups can be distinguished. In 1 K. 14:11; 16:4; 21:24, the prophet's threat culminates in the statement that the members of Jeroboam's/Baasha's/Ahab's family who die in the city will be eaten by dogs, while those who die in the open country will be eaten by the birds of the air. The other Dtr passages simply make the general statement that the corpses of the Israelites will be food for every bird of the air and beast of the field (Dt. 28:26//Jer. 7:33; Jer. 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20). Contrariwise, Ezk. 29:5 uses the topos in an oracle against Egypt. Its original setting, however, was probably the verbal abuse preceding a fight between champions, as illustrated by the words exchanged by David and Goliath (1 S. 17:44,46).[111]

An attenuated form of this topos, finally, may be incorporated into the image of the gigantic trees to which Pharaoh is likened in Ezk. 31 and Nebuchadnezzar in Dnl. 4. As a kind of intermediate stage, the immediate context in Ezekiel also uses the image of a crocodile thrown on the ground, on which the birds of the air will settle and with which the beasts of the field will gorge themselves (Ezk. 32:4). The destructive connotations of the topos are still clear in 31:13, whereas in 31:6 and Dnl. 4:9,18(12,21) the birds of the air and beasts of the field simply make use of the tree, to which they pose no threat.

Of course this traditio-historical reconstruction of how the topos developed belongs to the realm of speculation, but the purely secular usage of "heavens/sky" in all these passages is beyond question.

III. Usage Outside the OT.

1. *LXX*. In translating *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'*, the LXX consistently uses *ouranós* or occasionally, in psalms and hymns outside the Psalter as well as in late writings without an equivalent in the MT, the plural of the same lexeme, previously rare in Greek. According to Traub, the use of the plural in the former case does not represent a slavishly precise imitation of the Semitic *plurale tantum šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'*, but is due to the

111. Bartelmus, *Heroentum*, 134.

"plerophory of hymnic and doxological style." Its appearance in the late texts, he believes, can be traced to "the notion of a plurality of heavens which came from the Orient, along with the associated speculations."[112]

When one compares the LXX with the MT (using the Theod. text of Daniel), in only 9 passages is *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'* not represented by the corresponding Greek term *ouranós:* Dt. 7:24; Jer. 33(40):22,25; 51(28):48; Job 2:12; 22:12; Prov. 23:5; 30:19; Eccl. 2:3; Dnl. 4:23(26) (which uses the semantically equivalent adj. [*ep-*]*ouránios* instead of the noun). (This list does not take into account other ms. variants such as *ouránios* in Dt. 28:12 LXX^{A}.) Even if the so-called LXX text of the book of Daniel is used, the additional variation from the MT is slight (Dnl. 2:18,19; 6:28; also Dnl. 4–5, where the LXX displays a relatively independent text, in which the term "heaven" occurs more often than in the MT [20 times instead of 16]).

If we observe that in the case of the Jeremiah passages the LXX text is shorter than the MT (in Jer. 33[40], vv. 14-26 of the MT are lacking, and in ch. 51[28], vv. 45-48), and that in Job 22:12 and Dnl. 6:28 the LXX has a different text, we can say that the LXX clearly considered *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'* and *ouranós (ouranoí)* to be identical terms. Three (or five) of the remaining five (or eight) variants represent rationalizing "paraphrases" (Dt. 7:24; Prov. 23:5; 30:19; Dnl. 2:18,19), which do not challenge the identity of the two terms. In Eccl. 2:3 the translator appears to have inserted (by mistake?) the phrase "under the sun," which in this context is redundant and almost semantically equivalent.[113] The variation in Job 2:12 may be due to ignorance on the part of the Greek-speaking community concerning the ancient Near Eastern practice of throwing dust into the air (and thus upon one's head) as a sign of sympathetic grief.

But this survey is far from including all the instances of *ouranós* in the LXX. In no fewer than 46 passages (again taking the Theod. text of Daniel), the LXX has introduced the term "heaven" into the existing Hebrew text; in addition, there are 18 passages where other terms than *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'* are represented by *ouranós,* and one where a different term is represented by *epouránios.* In examining the distribution of *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā',*[114] we have already observed the tendency of heaven to play an increasingly central role in the course of Israel's religious history. The evidence of the LXX clearly confirms this observation.

The observation that other terms than *šāmayim/šᵉmayyā'* can be represented by *ouranós (epouránios)* does not contradict our earlier conclusion that we may assume the semantic identity of the two terms. Indeed, it confirms what we have already noted concerning the lexical field[115] and usage[116] of "heaven" in the biblical text: *ouranós* represents *mārôm* in Isa. 24:18,21, *rāqîa'* in Dnl. 12:3, and *šaḥaq* in Ps. 89:38(88:37). In this context we must also take into account such expressions as *hē/tá hyp(ó) ouranón (ouranṓn),* for which the groundwork is already laid in the MT by Eccl. 1:13;

112. P. 510-11.

113. See I.2 above; also *BHS* on Eccl. 1:13.

114. See I.2 above.

115. See I.3 above.

116. See II.1.b and II.3 above.

2:3; 3:1; Job 28:24; 37:3; 41:3(11). They can now be employed redundantly as synonyms for *'ereṣ* (Job 2:2; 9:6; 18:4; 38:18,24,33; 42:15; plus 4 instances in interpolations: Est. 4:17c; Job 1:6,7; 9:13), *ḥûṣôṯ* (Job 5:10), *tēḇēl* (Job 34:13; Prov. 8:26), or *t^ehôm* (Prov. 8:28; cf. Job 9:13, indicating the dwelling place of the sea monster). Finally, in Isa. 14:13 and Job 22:26 *ouranós* represents *'ēl/'^elôah,* and in Ps. 68:15(67:14); 91(90):1, *šadday* is translated *ho epouránios/ho theós toú ouranoú.*

Traub asserts that in this last variant and in the additions to the MT we see manifested "the OT belief that God, as Creator of heaven and Ruler of heaven, is linked with heaven."[117] This claim is plausible with respect to God as sovereign, but is unlikely with respect to God as creator. In any case the identification of *'ēl/'^elôah* and *ouranós* clearly accords with the personal usage of "heaven" in Dnl. 4:23(26);[118] it precludes any association with heaven as part of God's creation. The same is true of similar passages in the LXX books that do not appear in the MT: heaven is called "lawgiver" (2 Mc. 3:15), Heliodorus is told that he has been flogged by heaven (3:34), the third of the seven brothers to be martyred thanks heaven for giving him his bodily parts (7:11), the eldest of the brothers calls Antiochus IV "the enemy of heavenly righteousness" (4 Mc. 9:15), and the fifth brother foretells "the vengeance of heavenly righteousness" upon Antiochus (11:3). Finally, the Jews avow that their ancestors "sinned against the Lord of Israel, the heavenly one" (1 Esd. 6:14; the parallel text in 2 Esd. 5:12 reads instead *theós toú ouranoú*).

In addition, 1 Maccabees uses "heaven" almost as a synonym for "God": 3:19 declares that strength comes from heaven; in 3:50; 4:10,40; 5:31; 9:46 (3 Mc. 6:17), the oppressed Jews cry aloud to heaven; in 3:60 Judas Maccabeus appeals to the will in heaven; in 4:24,55 (2 Mc. 15:34) heaven is praised for showing mercy and bestowing prosperity; according to 12:15; 16:3 (2 Mc. 8:20; 15:8; cf. also 3 Mc. 4:21; 5:50; 6:30), help comes from heaven alone. In 2 Maccabees, finally, we read that the seven martyred brothers are children of heaven (7:34; cf. 4 Mc. 17:5, where they are likened to the stars of heaven and promised a dwelling place in heaven together with their mother; 3 Mc. 6:28, where all Jews are called children of heaven). We also read that the judgment of heaven hovers over Antiochus (9:4), who for his part places his hope (vainly) in heaven (9:20); the Jews can advance fearlessly against Lysias because they have "an ally from heaven" (11:10).

Behind most of the other texts in the books of Maccabees where *ouranós (ouránios)* appears, we may recognize the notion of heaven as God's dwelling place in its original form, before it underwent further theological development; 2 Mc. 3:39 and 3 Mc. 2:15 refer to heaven explicitly as God's dwelling place. In the latter passage, we even find the elative *ouranós toú ouranoú,* modeled after such texts as Dt. 10:14: this locus of God is inaccessible to mortals. In 3 Mc. 6:18 the gates of heaven are opened so that two angels sent by God can come to the aid of the Jews. People raise their arms heavenward to address God or God's heavenly host in prayer (2 Mc. 3:20; 14:34; 15:21; 3 Mc. 5:25;

117. P. 510.

118. See the discussion of 1 K. 8:32,34,36,45 in II.1.b above.

4 Mc. 4:11), but prayers rise up to heaven almost of themselves (3 Mc. 5:9). Similarly, Eleazar looks heavenward at his martyrdom (4 Mc. 6:6). It is common knowledge that Elijah was taken up into heaven (to God) (1 Mc. 2:58) and that Yahweh rained fire down from heaven (2 Mc. 2:10; cf. Lev. 9:24 [without the word "heaven"]; 2 Ch. 7:1). The author of 2 Maccabees remembers the appearances from heaven that came to those who fought faithfully on behalf of Judaism (2 Mc. 2:21; cf. Dnl. 6:28[27]) and relates how five figures on horseback appeared from heaven to the enemies of the Jews (2 Mc. 10:29). Insofar as 2 Mc. 9:10 alludes to Isa. 14:13-15, it conveys the notion that the heavenly realm is the realm of God.

On the other hand, only a single text in the books of Maccabees says that God made heaven (and earth) (2 Mc. 7:28). The merism and the context suggest that the author is thinking less of heaven in the sense of the Mesopotamian cosmology than of God's having made everything (including human beings) out of nothing; the subsequent words of the mother of the seven martyr brothers to her youngest son suggest as much. Finally, there is one instance of the expression "under heaven" as a synonym of "earth" (2 Mc. 2:18) and one of the turn of phrase that calls on heaven and earth as witnesses (1 Mc. 2:37).

The books of the LXX have 46 passages, also represented in the MT, where *ouranós* appears without a Hebrew equivalent. Most of these texts are consonant with our previous observations.[119] Only rarely is there a mention of heaven as something created, in the sense of the Mesopotamian cosmology incorporated into such texts as Gen. 1 and Deutero-Isaiah. We find *ouranós* in contexts that speak of phenomena traditionally associated with heaven or the heavens — birds (Gen. 40:17,19; Isa. 18:6; Ezk. 34:5; Hos. 2:14[12]; Ps. 50[49]:11; cf. 3 Kgdms. 12:24, where the LXX has inserted the text of 1 K. 14:11), clouds (Job 7:9), winds (Ezk. 37:9), or the sun (3 Kgdms. 8:53a; relying on idiosyncratic translations and emendations, Albright interprets this text as an apologetic reflex of Phoenician notions: the worshiper expresses the conviction that Yahweh is to be placed above Baal Shamem and Baal Zaphon).[120]

Appropriate expressions using *ouranós* are also inserted when smoke or fire rises up (Josh. 8:21; Dt. 9:15), when Moses lifts his hand or staff (Ex. 9:29; 10:13), when Elijah calls on Yahweh (1 K. 18:36) or a supplicant's eyes look up to Yahweh (Isa. 38:14), when God calls down (Ex. 19:3 LXX^{B}; in MT and $LXX^{A,R}$, Yahweh calls from the mountain — a mitigation of the more extreme anthropomorphism of the original), or when fire comes down (1 K. 18:38). It is noteworthy that the ground is prepared for most of these additions by the appearance of an appropriate verb or by the mention of heaven in the immediate context; i.e., generally the LXX merely expands the text for the sake for clarity.

This observation holds true also and especially for the additions in Gen. 1:9; Dt. 30:4; Jgs. 13:20; Isa. 13:10; Ezk. 32:7 (LXX^{A}); Hos. 2:23(21); Ps. 19(18):6(5); Dnl. 8:10 (Theod.); Neh. 1:9, which only repeat explicitly or develop further something al-

119. See II.1.b and II.3 above.
120. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, 1968), 201.

ready said. It probably holds true also for 2 Ch. 6:23 (LXX^{B}) and Ps. 115:3 (113:11; LXX^{S}), where the repetition of *ouranós* could well be a copyist's error occasioned by vv. 18 and 16(24) respectively but is quite in accord with the text. In Dnl. 9:3-4 (LXX^{A}), too, the expansion "God 'of heaven'" probably represents assimilation to the context, despite the fact that the passage is relatively distant from 2:18-44, the original locus of the expression. The same is true of the addition in 3:17, which probably derives from 2:28, as well as for Dt. 8:19, where the invocation of heaven and earth as witnesses (instead of Moses [MT]) probably represents an interpolation from Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28.

The situation differs in the case of Hos. 13:4, which the translator clearly took as a quotation from Ex. 20:2-3 (probably the reverse of the historical situation[121]) and therefore expanded in the sense of Ex. 20:11 by borrowing from Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 45:12; 48:13) and Neh. 9:6: Yahweh not only brought Israel out of Egypt, but also created heaven and earth and all the host of heaven. The situation is probably similar in Isa. 5:30 and 8:21, where the expansion of the earthly perspective of the MT to include heaven is probably due to the translator's interpretation of the affliction as the day of Yahweh and accordingly expanded the text with appropriate topoi from Isa. 13:10; Jer. 4:23; etc. In 5:30 the addition was probably also occasioned by the *l*^{e}*māʿlâ* of the MT. In Dt. 5:14 (LXX^{B}) and 32:43, too, we are dealing with quotations from formally comparable texts that expand the message of the text: the translator or copyist has added material from the Decalog in Ex. 20:11 to the first passage and from Ps. 96:11 = 1 Ch. 16:31 to the second.

The situation is just the opposite in the Prayer of Mordecai, which the LXX inserts following Est. 4:17 (a total of 24 verses). Here, in a list of Yahweh's mighty acts, v. 17c refers to the creation of heaven and earth and every wonderful thing under heaven. In comparison to the MT, where there is no instance of *šāmayim (ouranós)* in Esther,[122] the theological profile of this short book has shifted considerably.

Finally, besides these additions to books of the Hebrew canon, we must discuss at least briefly the occurrences of *ouranós* in the additional extracanonical material found in the LXX. Except for the books of Maccabees, we have mentioned these documents only in passing. They contain 115 (additions to Daniel according to Theod.) or 114 (additions to Daniel according to the "LXX") instances of the noun, together with 10 of the adj. *(ep-)ouránios* and one of the adv. *ouranóthen* ("from heaven": 4 Mc. 4:10). All told, the LXX uses *ouranós* 626 or 625 times; if we include the derivatives, there are 637 (636) occurrences, with 49 of the plural. (Traub finds 667 occurrences, including 51 of the plural, clearly counting both the Theod. and "LXX" occurrences instead of treating them as parallel traditions.)[123]

This (relatively) large number of occurrences of "heaven" in the LXX documents of early Judaism confirms our earlier religio-historical conclusion,[124] based on the minor

121. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 163.

122. See I.2 above.

123. Pp. 509-10.

124. See I.2 above.

additions to the documents in the MT of the Hebrew canon: heaven plays an increasingly central role in Jewish theological thought in the late OT period and in the intertestamental period.

The most extensive corpus of documents from this period, 1-4 Maccabees, contains roughly half of all the occurrences of "heaven" (47 of *ouranós,* 10 of *[ep-]ouránios/ouranóthen*). We have already discussed this material, concluding that in these books heaven is usually viewed as the dwelling place of the deity, in accordance with Canaanite cosmology,[125] and is then often identified with the deity. The other texts of the so-called Apocrypha do nothing to challenge this picture, although in them heaven does appear somewhat more often as a secular entity than in Maccabees. References to heaven as something created by God, on the other hand, are quite rare, and always appear in the merism "heaven and earth" (1 Esd. 6:12; Jth. 13:18; Bel 5), which is more a way of saying "everything" than an allusion to the cosmology of Gen. 1. Apart from Sirach, the only specific reference to Gen. 1 is in the Song of the Three Young Men, which speaks explicitly of the firmament and the waters above the heavens (Dnl. 3:56,60; cf. also 1 Esd. 4:34).

Although "heaven" is rare in secular contexts, when it does appear its usage does not diverge essentially from that in the MT: birds as flying creatures are called "birds of the air" (Jth. 11:7; Bar. 3:17; Dnl. 3:80) or are situated between heaven and earth (Ep. Jer. 53, in a polemic against idols that compares the gods of the Gentiles to crows). We also read of the "stars of heaven" (Dnl. 3:36). With cosmological overtones associated with the permanence of heaven, Bar. 1:11 cites Dt. 11:21 almost word for word. Finally, Bar. 2:2 and 5:3 employ the expression "under heaven" in the sense of "earth," as commonly in Ecclesiastes and Job.

Viewed from a theological perspective, the number of genitive phrases and attributive or prepositional constructions associating "heaven" with God in these documents is noteworthy. Genitive phrases with *ouranós* include practically all the important terms for the deity: *theós,* "God" (Tob.^{BA} 10:11; Tob.^{S} 7:13; 8:15; Jth. 5:8; 6:19 [in combination with the vocative *kýrie!*]; 11:17; 1 Mc. 3:18); *basileús,* "King" (1 Esd. 4:46,58; Tob.^{BA} 13:9,13; Tob.^{S} 1:18; 13:17; 3 Mc. 2:2 [again in combination with the vocative *kýrie!*]); *kýrios,* "Lord" (Tob.^{BA} 10:13; Tob.^{S} 6:18; 7:12,17 [in Tob.^{BA} 7:17 in an expanded merism analogous to Gen. 24:3]; 10:11,14); *dynástēs,* "Sovereign" (2 Mc. 15:23); *despótēs,* "Lord" (Jth. 9:12 [here as in Tob.^{BA} 7:17 in an expanded form analogous to Gen. 24:3]). An expression appearing only peripherally in the MT ("King/Lord of heaven" in Dnl. 4:34[37] and 5:23) is now used redundantly and with a variety of nuances. The only traditional expression is "God of heaven," although it too gained currency only thanks to political conditions in the Persian Empire.

Furthermore, attributive constructions with *epouránios* and the prepositional constructions with *en ouranṓ̧* are not limited to the lexeme *theós* (as in 3 Mc. 7:6 and Tob. 5:17; with the addition of *oikṓn* in Tobit^{A}): in 3 Mc. 6:28 we find *huioí toú pantokrátoros epouraníou theoú zṓntos,* and in 2 Mc. 15:4, *kýrios zṓn autós en ouranṓ̧.*

125. See II.1.b above.

Finally, we also find *dynástēs* in a prepositional construction with *en ouranṓ̧* (2 Mc. 15:3).

Otherwise, the theological usage of "heaven" largely conforms to that observed in Maccabees and the MT. The only new features are the expression "light of heaven" (Tob.[S] 5:10) and the situation of wisdom in heaven (Wis. 9:10). From heaven, good may be expected (Tob.[S] 7:12; similarly 9:6), as the manna episode shows (Wis. 16:20; cf. Ex. 16:4); therefore one lifts up one's face to heaven in prayer (1 Esd. 4:58; Sus. 35; negated: Sus. 9). But from heaven the all-powerful word of God can also bring punishment in the form of a warrior reaching from earth to heaven (Wis. 18:15-16). Misdeeds mount up to heaven (1 Esd. 8:72), which mortals can neither fathom (Wis. 9:16) nor reach (Bar. 3:29). Heaven (and earth) can appear as witnesses (Jth. 7:28); they also sing the praises of truth (1 Esd. 4:36) and God (Tob. 8:5 [here "creation" replaces "earth"]; Dnl. 3:59); the stars may play the same role (Dnl. 3:63). Nevertheless, they are wrong who consider the luminaries of heaven to be gods (Wis. 13:2); these so-called gods cannot even show the Gentiles signs in the heavens (Ep. Jer. 66).

2. *Sirach.* The situation is totally different in the book of Sirach, with its 14 (LXX) or 10 (Hebrew) occurrences of "heaven": it bears the clear stamp of Gen. 1 and the associated cosmology (see, e.g., Sir. 16:25–17:4). We find the elative "heaven of heavens" in 16:16 (Heb.; 16:18 LXX) in a list of the works of creation (cf. Neh. 9:6), along with the abyss *(tᵉhôm/ábyssos)* and the earth. All three — as well as the mountains and the foundations of the earth, mentioned immediately afterward — are described as quaking when Yahweh visits or looks upon them (a motif borrowed from theophanies).

Sir. 24:5, where Wisdom says that she compassed the vault of heaven and traversed the depths of the abyss, probably presupposes the Mesopotamian cosmology (cf. also 43:12[h], which borrows the terminology of Job 22:14 [*ḥûg*]; LXX *egýrōsen ouranón en kyklṓsei dóxēs*). This cosmology is also presupposed in Sir. 1:3, which speaks of the impossibility of searching out the height of heaven, the breadth of the earth, and the depths of the sea, as well as in 43:1,8(LXX),9. All four texts echo the *rāqîaʿ* concept of Gen. 1.

When Sir. 45:15 and 50:24[h] speak of the "days of heaven," as in Dt. 11:21 and Ps. 89:30(29), again we hear the notion of heaven as a created entity that can pass away, even if only in the distant future. Sir. 17:32 is quite similar: the statement that God marshals the heavens recalls such texts as Gen. 1:4,31. Gen. 1 is probably also behind the use of the expression "under heaven" as a substitute for "earth" in Sir. 16:15 — in contrast to its less specific meaning elsewhere.

Even two of the three occurrences of "heaven" in the hymn honoring ancestors — the great retrospective survey of sacred history that concludes the book — appear to presuppose the Mesopotamian cosmology or at least to admit it in the background (Sir. 48:3,20; cf. 1 K. 17:1; 18:1 and Dt. 11:17; 28:12; also 2 K. 19:14-34//Isa. 37:14-35). Only in Sir. 46:17, which draws on 1 S. 7:10 (in combination with 2 S. 22:14//Ps. 18:14[13]), can we perceive an allusion to the notion of heaven as God's dwelling place.

With respect to the notion of heaven, Sirach constitutes an exception within the so-

called Apocrypha. Sirach is the only clear dissenting voice countering the tendency of early Judaism — displayed most clearly in the books of Maccabees — to magnify the theological importance of heaven. But even Sirach could not halt the development of the stereotyped (theological) use of "heaven" as a synonym for the domain of God or for the very person of God.

3. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls fits almost seamlessly within the picture drawn by the LXX. We will deal first with the more peripheral texts. References to statements that treat heaven as a created entity are few and highly formulaic: they appear in hymns like 1QH 1:9 and 11QPs^{a} 26:14, which mention the spreading out of the heavens, or 4Q381 1 3, a free quotation of Neh. 9:6. There is also 4QpNah 1-2 2, which interprets Nah. 1:3 as meaning that whirlwind and storm refer to nothing other than the *rāqîaʿ* of heaven and the earth; and 4Q504 1-2 7:6-8, where we find a unique hybrid combining the notions of dwelling place and *rāqîaʿ* (cf. also 4Q503 1-6 3:1 and 4Q511 30 2).

Another group out of step with the trend during the intertestamental period comprises the sections of the book of Enoch that deal specifically with astronomical phenomena (4QEnAstr^{b} 23:1-8; 4QEn^{g} 1 4:23-24 [the replacement of the first heaven by a new heaven]; 4QEn^{c} 1 1:18 [identifying the "work" of heaven with the courses of the heavenly bodies]).[126] Finally, there are biblical quotations like 11QtgJob 13:2 (= Job 28:21), where the ideas of the text being translated are naturally reflected (cf. also 11QtgJob 10:[2]; 31:[6]).

Elsewhere, "heaven" appears almost exclusively as a synonym for God or God's domain. Of course this general statement must be qualified by the observation that a great many of the texts usually cited cannot be classified, either because the context or the reading of the text itself is not clear (1QH fr. 58:6; 1Q30 3 3; 1Q34 3 1:4; 3Q12 1 3; 3Q14 3 3; 4Q381 76-77 16; 4Q482 2 2; 4Q482 6 1; 4Q497 28 2; 4Q502 9 6; 4Q503 27 2; 4Q504 5 1:6; 4Q511 3 7; 4Q511 122 3; 4Q511 135 2; 5Q25 2 1; 6Q8 32 1; 6Q8 37 3; 8Q5 14; 11QPsAp^{a} 1:10; 3:3). We shall also omit from our discussion the passages where the editors have totally reconstructed the text (e.g., 4QEn^{a} 1 4:6; 4QEn^{a} 16 2:10; 4QEn^{b} 1 3:7; 4QEn^{c} 1 6:4; 4Q379 1 29; 4Q381 33 2).

The few texts not fully consistent with our general statement do not represent the cosmology of Gen. 1. In 1Q22, the "Words of Moses" paraphrasing Deuteronomy, heaven and earth appear as witnesses (1:5; cf. Dt. 4:26, etc.; also the Bar Kochba letter Mur 43:3[127]); the same document says that God can shut up the heavens so that rain will not fall (2:20; cf. Dt. 11:17, etc.). If we may interpret the latter statement in the light of 1QSb 1:4, which speaks of opening the heavens as a kind of spring (cf. also 1QH 8:17 [although the reading "heavens" is disputed] and 11QBer 1:7) while drawing explicitly on the dwelling-place concept (cf. 4QM^{a} 11 1:13; 4Q511 10 12), it does not constitute an exception but fits in with the general picture.

126. Beyer, 714.
127. *DJD*, II (1961), 159-61.

We might also treat 1QM 10:8 as a minor exception to the general rule: the rhetorical question "Who is like you . . ." continues ". . . in heaven and on earth," so that the earth appears also as belonging to God's domain (cf. 1 K. 8:23//2 Ch. 6:14; Ps. 113:6; 1QH fr. 13 3 may also belong here). But this text does not really contradict our general statement, especially since it has a kind of parallel in 1QH 16:3, where the glory of God fills heaven and earth (= everything; cf. Ps. 148:13, which represents an initial stage of the notion of omnipresence). In addition, 1QM 12:18 even implies that God can rise above the heavens, a notion that undoubtedly must be taken as a further embellishment of such statements. The vision of Levi (4QTLevi ar[a] [4Q213] 2:26-28) is unique, although it fits this context without difficulty: he sees heaven opened and is raised to the gates of heaven by the mountain on which he is standing (cf. 4QEn[a] 1 4:10; 4QEn[b] 1 3:10).

Elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls we find basically the same notions as in the Apocrypha and Daniel. This holds true particularly for 1QapGen, where the new theology has to some extent replaced the old even in the "quotations" from Gen. 14:19,22 (1QapGen 22:16,21). Instead of the maker of heaven and earth, we now find the "Lord" *(mrh)* of heaven and earth (cf. esp. Tob.[BA] 7:17; Jth. 9:12). The "Lord" of heaven alone appears also in 1QapGen 7:7; 12:17, the "King" of heaven in 1QapGen 2:14 (cf. already *AP* 30.15; Dnl. 5:23; Tob.[S] 6:18, etc.; 1 Mc. 15:23; Dnl. 4:34[37]; Tob.[S] 1:18, etc.; in 4Q400 2 3-4 and 4Q401 14 1:6, we find the abstract expression "heaven of his kingdom"). A similar expression *(šlṭn šmy')* occurs in 4QEnGiants[b] 1 2:16.

Therefore the devout member of the Qumran community lifts his eyes to heaven when he wants to pray (4QTLevi ar[a] 1:8). Conversely, he knows that God came down from heaven at Sinai to instruct Israel (4Q381 69 5a; cf. Ex. 19:3 LXX[B] and Neh. 9:13). God also wages war from heaven on behalf of the community (1QM 11:17). Similar language can be used of the warriors or "host" of heaven (1QH 3:35-36; cf. Jgs. 5:20), whose dwelling place is in heaven, where also dwell the multitude of God's holy ones (cf. 1Q19 2 1?), i.e., God's elect (1QM 12:1). Other texts speak explicitly of the "elect of heaven" (1QM 12:5) or the "holy ones of heaven" (4QEn[b] 1 3:11[128]).

Finally, that the identification of God and heaven became a theological commonplace at Qumran is shown by the use of *b^enê šāmayim/š^emîn* or *mal'^akê šāmayim* for the figures called *b^enê (hā-)'^elōhîm* in the OT (1QS 4:22; 11:8; 1QH 3:22; 1QH fr. 2 10; 1Q19 14 2; 1QapGen 2:5,[16]; 5:[4] and 1QH 19:2[?]; 1QH fr. 1 1). Twice, in an echo of Dnl. 4:10,20(13,23), they are also called "guardians of heaven" (CD 2:18; 4QEn[c] 1 6:8).

Bartelmus

128. Beyer, 713-14. This last text may allude to the angels who fell from heaven, i.e., the angels formerly belonging to God's heavenly court who had intercourse with human women. See J. A. Fitzmyer and D. A. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 76-77.

שָׁמִיר *šāmîr*; שַׁיִת *šayiṯ*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Usage. III. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Meaning. Heb. *šāmîr* is a primary noun, cognate with Arab. *samur*, which native lexicographers identify as denoting "a particular type of tree with slender leaves and short thorns and a yellow fruit."[1] Precise botanical identification of *šāmîr* is impossible: as is so often the case, Hebrew terminology does not coincide with our conceptions. Löw[2] identifies it with Christ's-thorn *(Paliurus aculeatus)*; Dalman, following Saadia,[3] suggests the wild carrot *(Daucus aureus)*. It is best, however, to stay with a general term like "briar bush."

We always find *šāmîr* in conjunction with *šayiṯ*, either in parallelism or in the phrase *šāmîr wāšayiṯ*. Heb. *šayiṯ* also appears to be a primary noun; a proposed derivation from the root *š'h* is highly questionable.[4] A noun *šyt* meaning "thornbush" is attested in an Aramaic inscription from Sefire, unfortunately in a damaged context.[5] Dalman considers *šayiṯ* a species of *Achillea*;[6] as in the case of *šāmîr*, however, precise identification is impossible, and may not be intended by the biblical text.

II. Usage. Each of the two nouns occurs 8 times in the OT. All occurrences are in the book of Isaiah, in both early and late texts. In every case the combination characterizes the vegetation of an uncultivated and inhospitable area where only "briars and thorns" grow; other texts use the phrase *qôṣ wᵉdardar* in the same way.[7] In the Dead Sea Scrolls the two pairs of words are used together.[8] Such areas are the "world of death," in contrast to the "world of life," land that is cultivated and settled.[9] The Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7) describes what happens when Yahweh ceases to tend the vineyard: "I will make it a waste *bāṯâ)* . . . . Briars and thorns *(šāmîr wāšayiṯ)* will spring up *('ālâ)* there" (v. 6).

According to Isa. 7:23-25, a time will come when every field where a thousand vines grow will become *šāmîr wāšayiṯ*; people will hunt there because the land is full of *šāmîr wāšayiṯ*. People will not venture to go there for fear of briars and thorns. Wilderness has replaced cultivated fields. Isa. 9:17(Eng. 18) alludes to the flammability of briars: they will be consumed by the fire of wickedness. The same notion appears in

1. *HAL*, II, 1562, citing Lane, I/4, 1425.
2. I. Löw, *Flora der Juden*, III (Vienna, 1924), 133.
3. G. Dalman, *AuS*, II (1932), 321.
4. *HAL*, II, 1486.
5. *KAI* 223A.5; *DISO*, 299.
6. *AuS*, II, 321.
7. → קוץ *qôṣ*.
8. See III below.
9. See *ILC*, I-II, 455.

10:17: the light of Israel (viz., Yahweh) will become a fire that will consume the briars and thorns of Assyria.

In the eschatological Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 27:2-6) that turns the threat of Isa. 5 into a promise, Yahweh promises to battle the briars and thorns that threaten the life of the vineyard, to burn them with fire, and to tend and irrigate the vineyard once more. Finally, Isa. 32:12-13 exhorts the people to mourn the devastation of the fields, where now only *šāmîr wāšayiṯ* grow up.

III. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *šāmîr* occurs only twice. 1QH 8:20ff. describes the Qumran community as a plantation tended by the one who laid it out. If he withdraws his hand, *qôṣ wᵉḏardar* will spring up and the plantation will turn into *šāmîr wāšayiṯ* (l. 25). Here the two OT expressions are combined.

The second occurrence (4Q368 10 2:5) is in an apocryphon on the Pentateuch. Here *šāmîr wāšayiṯ* appears without *qôṣ wᵉḏardar;* the latter in turn appears without *šāmîr wāšayiṯ* in the sapiential text 4Q423 2:3.

The LXX does not translate *šāmîr wāšayiṯ* consistently. Only in Isa. 7:23-25 is the pair of words retained and rendered by *chérsos* and *ákantha.* Elsewhere we find paraphrases, using not only *chérsos,* "dry," and *ákantha,* "thorns," but also words like *ágrōstis,* a kind of grass; *chórtos,* "grass"; *kalámē,* "stalk(s)"; and even *hýlē,* "stuff" (Isa. 10:17).

Ringgren

שָׁמַם *šāmam;* שָׁמֵם *šāmēm;* שְׁמָמָה *šᵉmāmâ;* שִׁמָּמוֹן *šimmāmôn;* מְשַׁמָּה *mᵉšammâ;* שִׁמְמָה *šimᵉmâ;* יְשִׁמֹן/יְשִׁימוֹן *yᵉšimōn/yᵉšîmôn;* יְשִׁמוֹת *yᵉšimôṯ*

I. Other Languages and Literatures. II. Distribution. III. Semantics: 1. Verbal Forms; 2. Adjectives and Nouns; 3. *yᵉšimôn/yᵉšimôṯ.* IV. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Other Languages and Literatures. Akkadian has a verbal root *šamāmu* with the meaning "paralyze"; all its occurrences have to do with the crippling of a part of the body.[1]

šāmam. J. V. Kinnier Wilson, "Hebrew and Akkadian Philological Notes," *JSS* 7 (1962) 173-83, esp. 178-79; N. Lohfink, "Enthielten die im AT bezeugten Klageriten eine Phase des Schweigens?" *VT* 12 (1962) 260-77; F. Stolz, "שׁמם *šmm* to lie deserted," *TLOT,* III, 1372-75.

1. R. C. Thompson, *Assyrian Medical Texts* (Oxford, 1923), nos. 77, 1:I, 1; 88, 1:11; 93, 3:12; *STT,* nos. 89:9,14,19,30; 91:87; R. Labat, *Traité Akkadien de diagnostics et prognostics médicaux* (Paris, 1951), no. 70.13; F. Köcher, *Die babylonsich-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1963), nos. 119:4; 438:8; 445:12; 449:iii.14; *CT* 23 46 iii 26; *KAR* 267:14.

The verb is attested in Babylonian and Assyrian in both the G stem and the D stem.[2] Subjects include *šīru(m)/šēru,* "flesh,"[3] and *qātu(m),* "hand,"[4] or "skull."[5]

The verb clearly does not denote a destructive activity; theological usage to describe a divine act is not attested.

The meaning "paralyze" suggests a relationship with the verbal root in Biblical Hebrew (Ezk. 3:15, hiphil; Ps. 143:4, hithpolel; Ezr. 9:3,4, polel).[6]

In Ugaritic the existence of *šmm* II (?), "be amazed, surpass," cannot be ruled out.[7]

Of interest both philologically and as a semantic parallel is the conditional curse to which the parties to the Aramaic treaty from Sefire (mid-8th century) submit themselves.[8] L. 32 states the consequence for anyone who breaks the treaty: "His grass shall be reduced to a wilderness *(yšmn).*"

The only occurrence in Biblical Aramaic is the ithpolel *'eštômam* in Dnl. 4:16(Eng. 19), "I was petrified with fear," describing the seer's reaction to Nebuchadnezzar's account of his dream and the demand to interpret it.

The survival of the lexical field beyond the period of the protocanonical biblical books is attested in the 2d/1st century B.C.E. by Sir. 9:7b and 49:6b, as well as by the Dead Sea Scrolls, with some 20 occurrences.[9]

II. Distribution. There are more than 200 biblical occurrences of a root *šmm;* approximately half of these are forms of the verb, while the rest are substantives. It is a matter of dispute whether a separate root *yšm* must be postulated in addition to the geminate root *šmm* to account for verbal and substantival forms with initial *y.* The occurrences in question do not exhibit any difference in meaning.[10]

The occurrences of the root are distributed throughout almost the entire Hebrew Bible (exceptions: Judges, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Esther, Nehemiah, 1 Chronicles).

III. Semantics. There is no equivalent to *šmm* in any modern language, with a single word group covering the semantic spectrum of the lexical field in Biblical Hebrew. Closest is the notion of "desolation," which can suggest the psychological states as well as the geographical and physical conditions denoted by forms of *šmm.*

---

2. *AHw,* III, 1154; *CAD,* XVII/1, 295.

3. E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben nach den Vortstellungen der Babylonier,* I (Berlin, 1931), 139 (no. 30 C, l. 14), 143 (no. 30 D, l. 21); *CT* 23 46 iii 26.

4. Labat, no. 42.39; *CT* 23 41, 15; Köcher, no. 119.4; Ebeling, 160 (no. 32 Mt 93 3, l. 11); *STT,* no. 89:9,14,19,30; 91:18,20.

5. Labat, no. 70.13.

6. See also Stolz, 1372-73; *GesB,* 843-44; *LexHebAram,* 860.

7. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 630, with bibliog.; *WUS,* no. 2631; B. Margalit, *A Matter of 'Life' and 'Death.' AOAT* 206 (1980), 92-93.

8. *KAI* 222A.

9. See IV.2 below.

10. *BLe,* §439p'.

1. *Verbal Forms.* a. *Qal.* The qal of *šāmam,* followed by a subject and without any additional grammatical element, can be predicated of arable land (Gen. 47:19), cultic high places and altars (Ezk. 6:6; the ancient versions read forms of *šmm* twice or interpreted the variant forms of the MT in this sense[11]), the land and its fullness (19:7), the princes of the sea (26:16), the mountains of Israel (33:28; also 35:12 *Q* [*K:* Israel]), the inheritance of Israel (35:15), and "all who pass by" (the ruins of the temple: 1 K. 9:8; their land: Jer. 18:16; this city: Jer. 19:8; devastated Edom: Jer. 49:17; absolutely: 2 Ch. 7:21). The negative condition as it affects both human beings and topographical or structural entities can be stated (Ezk. 35:12,15), lamented (Ezk. 19:7), abjured (Gen. 47:19), or threatened (all other instances). The context of Ezk. 36:3 suggests a transitive interpretation of the qal inf. *šammôṯ.*[12]

In 8 instances a qal form is expanded by a phrase with *ʿal,* always with a human subject (your enemies, Lev. 26:32; many, Isa. 52:14; the heavens, Jer. 2:12; everyone who passes by Babylon, Jer. 50:13; all the inhabitants of the isles, Ezk. 27:35; all who know you among the peoples, Ezk. 28:19; all who say to me, "Aha, Aha!" Ps. 40:16[15]; the upright, Job 17:8). The motivations introduced by *ʿal* are all highly unspecific.

In Ezk. 12:19 the object is introduced by *min:* "Of their water they shall drink in dismay." This construction is unique, but is supported by the LXX[13] and stands in immediate proximity to another motivating *min* phrase: "on account of the violence of all its inhabitants" (cf. 32:15). In 19:7 we find the more common construction, "The land and its fullness was appalled," coupled with *miqqôl šaʾᵃgāṯô,* "at the sound of his [the lion's] roaring."

Transitive and intransitive uses also appear together in texts employing the qal active participle: Tamar, raped and rejected by Amnon, "then lived as a desolate woman" (2 S. 13:20); the barren, widowed, and forsaken daughter of Zion is clearly described as being desolate (Isa. 54:1).

The state of Jerusalem's children lamented in Lam. 1:16 is best described as "disconsolate." The statement in v. 4 that "the roads to Zion mourn" and "all her gates are *šômēmîm* [destroyed? deserted? lonely?]" shows that descriptions of psychological and structural or topographical conditions can use the same vocabulary.

In Lam. 1:13 the 1st person lament of Jerusalem, pelted with fire from above and brought low by the hunter's snare, is more suggestive of being "shattered" by Yahweh.

The translation of Lam. 3:11 must remain uncertain. The uniquely formulated actions that bring about the problematic state of the speaker do not indicate clearly the extent to which the metaphors of dangerous wild animals are continued from v. 10 or where the image of the hunter that dominates the following verses begins.

The heritages of Israel that Deutero-Isaiah assigns to the Servant to apportion are described as "devastated," without further specification (Isa. 49:8).

Nominalized feminine plural forms mark the starting point for the coming change

---

11. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 179.
12. See below.
13. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 228.

of fortunes: "your waste places" (Isa. 49:19), "desolate wastes" (Ezk. 36:4), "former/ ages-old wastes" (Isa. 61:4).

The 5 occurrences of the qal in Daniel merit special attention. As we would expect in the conventional language of prayer, 9:18 moves within the boundaries already identified (fem. pl. ptcp.: "our waste places"). The MT as it stands[14] suggests an active sense for the qal participle in 8:13; 9:27; 12:11 (see the discussion of Ezk. 36:3 above).[15]

b. *Niphal.* In the use of the niphal, too, we may distinguish two groups of subjects affected by a state that can be denoted by forms of *šmm.* On the one hand, we find structures and geographical entities: "your roads" (Lev. 26:22), highways (Isa. 33:8), "your altars" (Ezk. 6:4), the soil of Israel (Ezk. 25:3), Egypt (Ezk. 30:7), storehouses (Joel 1:17), the high places of Isaac (Am. 7:9), battlements (of the destroyed nations, Zeph. 3:6), the land (Ezk. 36:34-35; Zec. 7:14), cities (Isa. 54:3; Ezk. 36:35; Am. 9:14), the squares of Jerusalem (Jer. 33:10), lands (Ezk. 29:12; 30:7), "the desolation" (Ezk. 36:36), the camp of the psalmist's enemies (Ps. 69:26[25]). On the other hand, we find human beings: the priests (Jer. 4:9), "one like the other" (Ezk. 4:17), they of the west (Job 18:20), "those who feasted on delicacies" (Lam. 4:5).

Participial forms qualify the subjects of various verbs: towns will be resettled (Isa. 54:3); the streets of Jerusalem will once more hear the voice of mirth (Jer. 33:10-11); on the day when iniquities are cleansed, the land will be tilled again (Ezk. 36:34); the waste and ruined towns will be fortified and inhabited once more (v. 35); the nations that are left will know that Yahweh has replanted the desolate fields (v. 36); when Yahweh restores the fortunes of his people Israel, they will rebuild the cities and inhabit them (Am. 9:14).

In addition to absolute use, we find again two expressions with *min:* "the land is stripped of all that fills it *(mimmᵉlō'â)*" (Ezk. 32:15), and those scattered by Yahweh's judgment leave behind a land so desolate "that no one goes to and fro." We also find a construction using *'al* in conjunction with a human subject: in Job 18:20 Bildad expresses his belief that the people of the west are "appalled" at the day of judgment *('al-yômô)* that overtakes the wicked.

The niphal forms in all these passages should probably be interpreted in a passive sense. We are clearly dealing with the work of a destructive will, which arouses terror in those affected — to the extent that they are thought of as having emotions.

Only the context, which threatens a drought, indicates that the people who are the subject of *šmm* niphal in Ezk. 4:17 are "dying of thirst."

c. *Hiphil and Hophal.* Nu. 21:30 must be treated as an exception. This poetic lament already led to various conjectures on the part of those who translated the ancient versions, without leading to a convincing answer. If we follow the MT in reading 1st person plural verbs at the beginning of both lines of v. 30 ("we shot at them" and "we laid waste"; *naššîm*), both subject and object are unclear.[16] The EÜ may be correct in con-

14. See O. Plöger, *Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 122, 135, for proposed emendations.

15. On the other occurrences of the qal participle see III.1.e below.

16. But cf. R. Althann, *Bibl* 66 (1985) 568-71.

jecturing a toponym Nashim, otherwise unattested (just like the following *nōpaḥ*, already rendered as *Nophe* by Vg.).

We would expect the subject performing the action denoted by the hiphil to be stated explicitly; in 10 of the 16 occurrences this subject is Yahweh (or "you" [= God] in Job 16:7; in Mic. 6:13 the context shows that Yahweh functions as the logical subject of the infinitive absolute). The entities affected by the action are "your sanctuaries" (Lev. 26:31), the land (v. 32), the people of Ashdod (1 S. 5:6), the Israelites (Ezk. 20:26), the land and its fullness (30:12), Pathros (30:14), many peoples (32:10), "her [Israel's] vines and fig trees" (Hos. 2:14[12]), Job's surroundings (Job 16:7).

There are also two texts stating that "the gentile nations have devoured Jacob and laid waste his pasturage" (Ps. 79:7; cf. Jer. 10:25, where the psalm text is quoted in expanded form in the context of a complex composition concerning divine and human wisdom, comprising elements of diverse provenance).

When used intransitively, the hiphil does not differ markedly in meaning from the qal (as is also true of *'rk, ḥrš, 'šr,* etc.[17]). As subject, we find *nāweh* (Jer. 49:20; 50:45) or a personal subject ("I sat stunned," Ezk. 3:15; "be appalled," an imperative addressed by Job to his friends, Job 21:5). There is no detectible difference in meaning from the analogous "invitation" — also an oxymoron — addressed to the heavens in Jer. 2:12 (qal).

The 4 occurrences of the hophal appear in threats in H (Lev. 26:34,35,43), where "days of desolation" (theological passive) are foretold for the land as compensation for failure to keep Sabbaths, and in 2 Ch. 36:21, which borrows the same formula to characterize the fate of the generation of the exile as fulfillment of a prophecy (ostensibly by Jeremiah).

d. *Hithpolel.* There are 5 occurrences of the hithpolel; the subjects are the lamenting psalmist (Ps. 143:4), the seer Daniel (Dnl. 8:27), the wisdom adept addressed by Qoheleth (Eccl. 7:16), and Yahweh (Isa. 59:16; 63:5). In each case the verb clearly refers to a psychological state. The range of translations in the lexicons ("astonishment, amazement, dismay, paralysis, horror, self-destruction") and the inconsistency of the ancient versions compel us to recognize that any interpretation can only be approximate.

Ps. 143 is a late individual lament; in v. 4 the psalmist describes his psychological state in the face of the deadly machinations of his enemies. In Dnl. 8:27 the seer describes his reaction to the vision of the ram and the he-goat. V. 27a clearly concludes the account; the redactional v. 27b serves to keep the chain of events open-ended. "Classic" reactions to revelatory experiences are probably in the background.

Two closely related late texts in the book of Isaiah (second recension?[18]) — one a 1st person statement by God (Isa. 63:5), the other a 3d person description of Yahweh (59:16) — describe how a theophany is elicited: God is forced to observe with horror (? amazement? anger? terror?) that no one has intervened to halt obvious injustice. In a

17. Bergsträsser, §19d.

18. O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr. SBS* 121 (1985), 51.

clear avoidance of anthropomorphisms, the LXX makes do with a "closer look" (*katenóēsen,* 59:16; *prosenóēsa,* 63:5) — in contrast to Ps. 143:4b (*etaráchthē hē kardía mou,* "my heart was appalled") and Dnl. 8:27 (*exelyómēn epí tǭ orámati,* "I was undone by the vision").

In contrast to this stative or passive sense, Eccl. 7:16 appears to use the hithpolel of *šmm* reflexively: "Do not act too wise — why should you destroy yourself (psychologically)?"[19]

e. *Polel Participle.* The two occurrences of the polel participle (Ezr. 9:3-4) appear in a 1st person account by Ezra of his reaction to the news that the returnees had not separated themselves from the inhabitants of the land and their abominations — concretely, that they had entered into mixed marriages. The verbs appear at the conclusion of a sequence of typical gestures of horror in the face of a heinous offense: "I tore my garment and my mantle, pulled hair from my head and beard, and sat appalled." This final action is then restated immediately as a continuing condition, during which there gathered around Ezra all those who were terrified at the (minatory) words of the God of Israel.

The sense is the same as in Ezk. 3:15, in the prophet's 1st person account of his call (which also speaks of other people and a period of time); he uses the hiphil participle of *šmm* to describe his reaction: "I sat there in their midst, stunned, for seven days." Revocalization as a polel[20] is unnecessary: Job 21:5 also uses the hiphil of *šmm* intransitively, in this case with the same meaning as the qal (cf. Jer. 2:12).

In Dnl. 9:27 and 11:31 we find the polel ptcp. *m^e^šômēm* used in a clearly transitive sense. If the MT of 9:27b is not emended,[21] the translation is: "In the middle of the week, he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and on the wings of abominations there will be something that brings desolation, until the end and decree of destruction are poured upon the desolator." This passage may be interpreted as follows: In the apocalyptic calculation of the end, the cessation (the hiphil of *šbt* may represent a secondary allusion to the person responsible, Antiochus IV) of the temple cult is foretold for the middle of the week. On the "wing of abominations" (*'al-k^e^nap̱*) (= the odious construction of an altar to Zeus; or the text may be emended to *ba'al k^e^nap,* an allusion to a title of the Syrian god of heaven, identified with Zeus Olympios[22]) will come something that brings desolation (*m^e^šōmēm*) — putting an end to the legitimate cult. The "end and decree of destruction" (cf. Isa. 10:23; 28:22) poured out on the desolator (*šōmēm*) are targeted for Antiochus IV (whose alterations in the cult are described in 1 Mc. 1:41-64 and 2 Mc. 6:1-5).

The different participles thus have different meanings. In view of the presence of both stative and active forms in several stems, the form *šōmēm* must be read as a qal participle rather than an abbreviated polel form.

---

19. See also F. Piotti, "Osservazioni su alcuni problemi esegetici nel libro dell' Ecclesiaste," *BeO* 22 (1980) 243-53.

20. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 95.

21. See also Plöger, *Daniel,* 135.

22. Ibid.

In the light of this analysis, Dnl. 11:31 may be translated: "They shall set up the abomination that brings desolation *(mᵉšômēm)*." Dnl. 12:11 may be interpreted as referring to "the abomination of a desolator *(šōmēm)*," and 8:13 similarly: "For how long is this vision concerning the regular burnt offering and the offense that there is a desolator *(šōmēm)*, who gives over the sanctuary and its service to be trampled?"

In Dnl. 9:18,26, the feminine plural participle has an intransitive sense: "(our) desolations," i.e., that which stands desolate in our midst. On the one hand, these desolations are a motive for intervention, brought to God's attention in Daniel's lament (9:18); on the other, they are an element of the divine plan revealed and interpreted apocalyptically by Gabriel ("decreed destruction," 9:27).

2. *Adjective and Nouns.* a. *Adjective.* The context of Jer. 12:11 is Yahweh's lament over the misdeeds of the many shepherds in his vineyard and favorite portion. The density of verbal and nominal forms of *šmm* is the result of extensive textual reworking.[23] The concentration of expressions denoting destruction in so short a text makes a powerful rhetorical impression, but limits the precise interpretation of the individual words.

In Lam. 5:18 the state of Zion is described by a verbal adjective illustrated by a telling detail — "foxes prowl over it."

Dnl. 9:17 is a typically formulated petition for relief from disaster: Daniel calls on "our God" to let his face shine (once more) on his desolated sanctuary "for the sake of Adonai."

b. *šᵉmāmâ.* Of the 55 occurrences of the noun *šᵉmāmâ,* only three appear outside prophetic texts. In the context of the concluding warnings and promises of the Covenant Code (probably the latest stratum), Ex. 23:29 explains why God will not drive out the indigenous inhabitants of the land in a single year. Were this to happen, the land would become *šᵉmāmâ* and wild animals would take it over. Here the term appears to mean "insufficiently populated" or even "devoid of inhabitants," but it takes on this relatively precise sense only from the context; in the light of its many other occurrences, we must content ourselves with the less vivid meaning "desolate." Lev. 26:33 appears among the curses and threats of H, making the general prediction that the land will become *šᵉmāmâ* and the cities a ruins *(ḥorbâ).*

Josh. 8:28 tells how Joshua, having taken the city of Ai by subterfuge, burned it and made it "forever a rubbish heap of *šᵉmāmâ* [cf. Jer. 49:2], as it is to this day."

The occurrences in the prophetic books exhibit a comparatively modest range of syntactic variation. Isa. 1:7 uses two noun clauses: "your land — a *šᵉmāmâ,* and your cities — burned with fire," finally adding: "like the destruction of Sodom" (MT "like destruction of foreigners"; because all other occurrences of *mahpēḵaṯ* are associated with Sodom [Dt. 29:22(23); Isa. 13:19; Jer. 49:18; 50:40; Am. 4:11], we may conjecture the same simile here and emend *zārîm* to *sᵉḏōm*). This text (though reconstructed) suggests that the destruction of Sodom is archetypal of *šᵉmāmâ.*

Joel 2:3 describes the effects of the day of Yahweh: "Before it the land is like the

23. See the reconstruction by K. Seybold, *VT* 36 (1986) 93-104.

garden of Eden, after it a wilderness of *š^e^māmâ*." Isaiah's question concerning the term of his call to proclaim judgment receives the answer (Isa. 6:11b) "until the land is left a *š^e^māmâ*" (if we accept a common emendation; the MT has the qal of *š'h,* "lie desolate," in v. 11a; a niphal *tiššā'eh* immediately following seems awkward and is generally emended to *tiš'ar*).

In Jer. 32:43 the discouraged Judahites call their land a *š^e^māmâ;* in Ezk. 35:14 the gloating Edomites use the same word to describe the land of their neighbors. According to Isa. 62:4, God will abolish this name.

Noun phrases are uncommon.[24] The more noteworthy are *miḏbar š^e^māmâ,* "desolate wilderness" (Jer. 12:10; Joel 2:3), and *š^e^māmâ ʿaḏ-ʿôlām,* "everlasting waste" (Jer. 49:33; cf. the pl. *šim^e^môṯ ʿôlām* in Jer. 51:26,62; Ezk. 35:9).

Besides appearing in noun clauses, *š^e^māmâ* also functions as a predicate noun with the vb. *hāyâ;* the subjects are (your) land/the whole land,[25] Jerusalem (Isa. 64:9), Rabbah (Jer. 49:2), Hazor (49:33), Chaldea (50:13), Babylon (51:26,62), Egypt (Ezk. 29:12), Mt. Seir (35:4,15), and Moab (Zeph. 2:9). Without any detectible difference in meaning, we find the expression *hāyâ + l^e^ + š^e^māmâ,* the subjects being the towns of Judah (Jer. 44:6), Egypt (Ezk. 29:9; Joel 4:19[3:19]), the land (Mic. 7:13), the houses of Judah (Zeph. 1:13), and Ashkelon (2:4).

Similarly, the act. vbs. *śîm* and *nāṯan* (with or without *l^e^*) with *š^e^māmâ* can have as objects the towns of Judah (Jer. 9:10[11]; 10:22; 34:22), my field (12:11), all idols (Mic. 1:7), the mountains of Esau (Mal. 1:3), the land of the Chaldeans (Jer. 25:12), Nineveh (Zeph. 2:13), my favorite portion (Jer. 12:10), the land (Ezk. 6:14; 15:8; 33:28,29), the land of Egypt (29:10,12; 32:15), and Mt. Seir (35:3,9).

In Jer. 10:22 the subject that accomplishes this destruction is a great noise; in 12:11 it is an impersonal "they"; and in 12:10, the many shepherds. In the vast majority of cases, however, it is Yahweh who unleashes his destructive power against idols (Mic. 1:7) or the enemies of his people, but also in judgment against his own people.

Although most of the occurrences of *š^e^māmâ* are associated with geographical or structural entities, we must not overlook the use of this noun with animate creatures: in Ezk. 7:27 the prince wraps himself in *š^e^māmâ;* in Mic. 1:7 Yahweh threatens to make all the idols of Samaria into *š^e^māmâ.*

c. *šammâ.* The noun *šammâ* appears to be largely synonymous with *š^e^māmâ;* it also is used in similar constructions. All its occurrences are in the context of judgment, threatened or remembered. (In Ps. 73:19 the normally collective term is applied to individual evildoers who have enjoyed success and prosperity.)

Of the word's 39 occurrences, 24 are in Jeremiah. The single occurrence in Ezekiel (Ezk. 23:33) is also the only instance of a genitive phrase: *kôs šammâ ûš^e^māmâ,* "the cup of horror and desolation," which Jerusalem must drink.

In verbal clauses *šammâ* appears as the subject of *š'r* (*šammâ* is left in the city, Isa.

---

24. On sequences see III.2.c above.

25. See above.

24:12), *hāyâ* (*šammâ* and a horrible thing are abroad in the land: prophets prophesy falsely, Jer. 5:30-31), and *ḥzq* hiphil (*šammâ* has taken hold of me, Jer. 8:21).

As a predicate noun with a double accusative, *šammâ* describes Israel (Dt. 28:37), Ephraim (Hos. 5:9), my vines (Joel 1:7), the land of Israel (Jer. 2:15; 4:7; 18:16; 25:9,11), Judah and Jerusalem (Jer. 44:22; 2 Ch. 29:8), Jerusalem and its inhabitants (2 K. 22:19; Jer. 19:8), many houses (Isa. 5:9), Jerusalem (Mic. 6:16), Jerusalem and the towns of Judah, its kings and officials (Jer. 25:18), those left in Jerusalem after 598 (Jer. 29:18), those who flee to Egypt (Jer. 42:18; 44:12), the people of Jerusalem warned by the prophets before the exile (Zec. 7:14), the wicked (Ps. 73:19), "your fathers and brothers" (2 Ch. 30:7), Noph/Memphis (Jer. 46:19), the towns of Moab (48:9), Bozrah (49:13), Edom (49:17), Babylon (50:23; 51:37,41), the land of Babylon (50:3; 51:29), the cities of Babylon (51:43), the earth (Isa. 13:9; Jer. 25:38). Here too we find persons as well as geographical and structural entities. Regions that become *šammâ* are no longer fit habitation for human beings and domestic animals (but may be inhabited by wild animals: Jer. 51:37; Zeph. 2:15; cf. Ex. 23:29, where *šᵉmāmâ* has the same meaning). Groups of people so described evoke a reaction of horror.

The active verbs used with *šammâ* are *šîṯ* qal (Jer. 2:15; 50:3), *śîm* (Isa. 13:9; Jer. 4:7; 18:16; 19:8; 25:9; 51:29; Joel 1:7), and *nāṯan* (Jer. 25:18; 29:18; Mic. 6:16).

In these cases and when used with *hāyâ, šammâ* is always constructed with *lᵉ* (only in Jer. 51:37 is the particle not repeated in a series). Usually the word appears as one element of a pair of words or of a stereotyped series, which emphasize the subjective elements of horror, accompanied by apotropaic hissing or whistling (*šᵉrēqâ,* 8 times in Jeremiah [plus 18:16 cj.?]; 2 Ch. 29:8), dread (*ša'ᵃrûrâ,* Jer. 5:30), aversive mockery (*šᵉnînâ* and probably also *māšāl,* Dt. 28:37), cursing (*qᵉlālâ,* 2 K. 22:19; Jer. 25:18; 44:12,22; 49:13; *'ālâ,* Jer. 29:18; 42:18; 44:12), repugnance (*ḥerpâ,* Jer. 29:18; 42:18; 44:12), or trembling (*za'ᵃwâ,* 2 Ch. 29:8 cj.), or else the objective element of physical destruction (*ḥorḇôṯ,* Jer. 25:9; *ḥorbâ,* Jer. 25:11,18; 44:22; *ḥōreḇ,* Jer. 49:13; *'ereṣ ṣiwwâ wa'ᵃrāḇâ,* Jer. 51:43).

The agent who produces *šammâ* is usually Yahweh, named more or less directly. As immediate agents, we also find "a nation (from the north)" that makes Babylon (Jer. 50:3) or "my vines" (Joel 1:7) *šammâ* and the prophet who bears the cup of staggering that brings desolation (Jer. 25:9). In Jer. 2:15 young lions are named as the agent and in 4:7 "a lion, a destroyer of nations" — but this lion is then identified as Yahweh (25:38). Finally, as a kind of theological quintessence, the introduction to the third strophe of Ps. 46 calls on people to behold "the works of Yahweh," identified as *šammôṯ* (the only instance of the plural).

d. *Other.* There are some 50 occurrences of our word family in the book of Ezekiel, almost a quarter of the total. Half are verbal forms, half substantives. Among the latter are some nouns not found elsewhere.

In Ezk. 4:16 and 12:18-19 the prophet is commanded as a symbolic act to eat and drink with quaking, trembling, and fearfulness. The associated interpretation foretells that the inhabitants of Jerusalem (ch. 4) and the exiles (ch. 12), too, will eat their bread with fearfulness and drink their water with *šimmāmôn;* in view of the parallelism, the latter noun can only mean "terror" or "dismay."

In the striking word pair *l^ešim^emâ ûš^emāmâ* (Ezk. 35:7), the hapax legomenon *šim^emâ* should probably be considered the result of an attempt to differentiate a garbled *š^emāmâ ûm^ešammâ* (cf. 6:14; 33:28,29; 35:7) through vocalization.[26] (In 35:7, unlike the other texts, the LXX uses two words formed from the same root; but the Greek translation of *š^emāmâ ûm^ešammâ* does not display much consistency.)

The 5 passages in which *m^ešammâ* appears are similar in content: in each instance Yahweh threatens to make a territory uninhabitable and impassable. In Ezk. 6:14 it is the land of Israel, here described uniquely from south to north as extending from the steppe (Judah) to Riblah (on the Orontes, where Nebuchadnezzar in 586 had those responsible for the rebellion against Babylon executed [2 K. 25:7,21]). In 33:28-29 it is the land of those left behind, and in 35:3,7, Mt. Seir, the land of the Edomites.

3. *y^ešimôn/y^ešimôṯ*. The 13 occurrences of *(hay)y^ešimôn* have received astonishingly varied treatment at the hands of ancient and modern translators. The anarthrous occurrences in surveys of sacred history in the Psalms were rendered by the LXX as *en tḗ erḗmō̧* (68[67]:8[7]), *en gḗ anýdrō̧* (78[77]:40), or *en anýdrō̧* (106[105]:14; 107[106]:4). (The latter translation is also used in Dt. 32:10; similarly in the promise of water in Isa. 43:19-20: *en tḗ anýdrō̧;* here the Vg., however, has *in invio.*) The Vg. continued this tradition with *in inaquoso* or *in deserto* (68:8[7]). In the *Psalterium iuxta hebraeos,* Jerome uses *in solitudine* or *per desertum* (68:8[7]). The EÜ varies the translation: "desert," "steppe," "wilderness," "wasteland"; Luther uses "desert," "wilderness" (bis), and "trackless (desert)." The NRSV has "wilderness" (3 times) and "desert wastes."

These texts undoubtedly involve topographically vague allusions to Israel's wandering in the wilderness recounted in the pentateuchal traditions. In the Pentateuch the word itself occurs only twice (Nu. 21:20; 23:28, with article; possibly also Dt. 32:10, where the text is problematic), in contrast to the synonymous par. *miḏbār* (with article) in Ps. 78:40; 106:14; 107:4. In the two occurrences in Numbers, the word is used to describe the top of Pisgah/Peor: *ʿal-p^enê hayy^ešîmōn,* "overlooking the wilderness." It is hardly possible simply to identify Pisgah and Peor on the evidence of Nu. 23:14 and 23:28,[27] but we may think of neighboring sites with views of the same region, either itself called Jeshimon or associated with an unidentified site bearing this name. (Luther simply says "the Jordan valley"; Vg. has *contra desertum* in 21:10 and *solitudinem* in 23:28.)

The 4 occurrences of *y^ešimōṯ* (Nu. 33:49; Josh. 12:3; 13:20; Ezk. 25:9) point to the same region (if not the same actual location). There is also Ps. 55:16(15) *(K); HAL* here abandons the divided reading *yaššîʾ māweṯ,* supported by *Q,* many mss., Aq., Symm., and modern comms. and translations, preferring instead the reading *y^ešimôṯ,* "desolation," on the basis of Nu. 33:49.[28] But all these passages concern Beth-jeshimoth, a lo-

26. With Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 225.
27. Cf. *HAL,* I, 447.
28. Ibid.

cality in the Ghor that belonged initially to the territory of King Sihon, then to Reuben, and finally to Moab[29] (note also the confusion of *Iesimon* and *Iesimut* in parts of the Vg. textual tradition in 1 S. 23:24).

All 4 occurrences of *y*ᵉ*šîmôn* with the article in 1 S. 23:19,24; 26:1,3 probably refer to a locality named Jeshimon (LXX *Iessaimoun;* Vg. *ad dexteram deserti* and *ex adverso solitudinis*). South of it are found the "strongholds of Horesh, on the hill of Hachilah" (23:19) and the "wilderness of Maon, in the Arabah" (23:24), first used as a hiding place by David and his followers, later the site of Saul's camp.[30]

IV. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

1. *LXX.* The LXX most often uses forms of two word families to translate the texts in question: *érēmos/erēmoún/erḗmōsis* (more rarely *exerēmoún*) in some 30% of the cases, *aphanismós/aphanízein* in some 40%. The latter word family — in sharp contrast to the former — is never used to represent *ḥrb* and its derivatives. Its also exhibits a surprising distribution: it is used exclusively in the Book of the Twelve and Lamentations, and is the preferred translation in Jeremiah and Ezekiel (appearing in about 40% of the relevant texts in each). Otherwise it appears only in 2 K. 22:19 and 2 Ch. 29:8, as well as in a portion of the textual tradition of Dnl. 9:18,26-27.

Instances of translation with *ábatos* are limited to Jeremiah. Among the various other translations, the 8 instances of *existánai/ékstasis* deserve mention.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Members of the word family appear some 20 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls; occurrences of the verb predominate. The range of meanings coincides by and large with usage in Biblical Hebrew. The texts speak of dismaying or scattering people (by God: CD 2:1; 4Q179 12-13 1:8; 4Q372 1 11) and horrifying the human heart (1QH 7:3; 18:20; cf. 4Q510 1 6). God is called on to remember the "desolate sons of his covenant" (4Q501 1 2; cf. the same idiom in 4Q508 4 1). The destruction or devastation of structural and geographical entities can be expressed by either the verb (CD 5:21; 4Q174 1 5; 4Q179 1 1:10) or a noun (4Q179 2 5; 4Q504 1-2 5:4). In 1QH 12:17 (fragmentary), we read of "times of devastation." In 11QT 59:5 (uniquely *šmm b*ᵉ), the Dtn law of kingship is expanded with curses and threats of punishment (cf. Lev. 26:31-32; Jer. 25:9-10).

Meyer

29. For the location see *HAL,* I, 127.

30. On the (questionable) attempts to locate the site in the vicinity of Ziph, see O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* II (Göttingen, 1982), 747-48.

שֶׁמֶן *šemen;* שָׁמֵן *šāmēn;* שָׁמָן *šāmān*

I. Ancient Near East: 1. Etymology; 2. Ugaritic; 3. Akkadian; 4. Hebrew Ostraca. II. Usage: 1. Occurrences; 2. General; 3. Cultic Use. III. *'ēṣ šemen.* IV. 1. *šāmān;* 2. *šāmēn.* V. Verb. VI. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Ancient Near East.

1. *Etymology.* Heb. *šemen,* "oil," is probably a primary noun, with etymological equivalents in most Semitic languages: Akk. *šamnu(m),* "oil, fat";[1] Ugar. *šmn,* "oil, fat";[2] Pun. *šmn* (in the combination *zbḥ šmn,* "oil offering");[3] Jewish Aram. *šᵉman* (in Tg. often for Heb. *ḥem'â*);[4] Christian Palestinian Aram. *šwmn';* Mand. *šumna;*[5] Syr. *šumnā',* "fattiness";[6] Arab. *samn,* "butter." There are no examples in Biblical Aramaic or Old Aramaic. The verb meaning "be(come) fat," found in several Semitic languages, would then be denominative; but the opposite possibility — that the noun is derived from a verbal stem — cannot be ruled out.[7]

2. *Ugaritic.* In Ugaritic, *šmn* is used occasionally in conjunction with fertility and rain.[8] One passage reads: *šmm šmn tmṭrn nḫlm tlk nbtm,* "the heavens rained fat, the wadis ran with honey" (after Baal was restored to life);[9] another speaks of *ṭl šmm šmn,* "the dew of the heavens, the fat of the earth."[10] In addition, the combination *yṣq šmn 'rṣ* appears twice in fragmentary contexts,[11] possibly with the same figurative meaning. Finally, *šmn* appears occasionally with *tîšr* as the name of a tree (cf. Isa. 41:19, where *'ēṣ šemen* occurs together with *ṯᵉ'aššûr*).[12]

3. *Akkadian.* Akk. *šamnu(m)* denotes both alimentary oil and anointing oil — in Babylonia usually sesame oil, in Assyria sometimes olive oil.[13] It also served ritual

---

šemen. G. Dalman, *AuS,* IV (1935), esp. 153-281; H. Frehen, "Öl," *BL*², 1258; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (Göttingen, 1984), esp. 78-80; E. Kellenberger, "Heil und Verstockung," *TZ* 48 (1992) 268-75; D. Kellermann, "Öl und Ölbereitung," *BRL*², 238-40.

1. *AHw,* III, 1157-58.
2. *WUS,* no. 2637.
3. *KAI* 69.12; 74.9; *DISO,* 309.
4. Jastrow, 1597.
5. *MdD,* 455.
6. *LexSyr,* 407.
7. *HAL,* II, 1567.
8. H.-J. Zobel, *ZAW* 82 (1970) 209-16.
9. *KTU* 1.6 III, 5-6, 12-13.
10. *KTU* 1.3, II, 39; IV, 43.
11. *KTU* 1.3, II, 31-35; 1.16, III, 1-4.
12. See III below.
13. *AHw,* III, 1157.

functions (oil poured on the head of a released slave, "pure oil" used in exorcisms) and was used for oleomancy.[14]

4. *Hebrew Ostraca.* Outside the Bible *šemen* appears on ostraca — 7 times on Arad ostraca that deal with consignments of oil (along with wine: 5:1-2; 11:3-4; bread: 7:5; flour: 13:1; by itself: 8:8; 14:2; 15:3; 17:4,8-9). Ostraca from Samaria mention *šmn rḥṣ* several times.[15] Here the term "wash" refers to the process of manufacture and purification, which results in a product of superior quality, used for cosmetic or alimentary purposes.[16]

II. Usage.

1. *Occurrences.* The noun *šemen* occurs 87 times in the OT, with 6 additional occurrences of *ʿēṣ šemen.* The verb occurs 3 times in the qal and twice in the hiphil, the adj. *šāmān* twice, and *šāmēn* 10 times.

2. *General.* In the OT oil is called either *šemen* or → יצהר *yiṣhār.* With the possible exception of Est. 2:12 ("oil of myrrh"), these words always refer to olive oil, which was produced by grinding olives in a mortar (*šemen kāṯîṯ,* Ex. 27:20; 29:40; Lev. 24:2; Nu. 28:5; 1 K. 5:25) or else by treading or pressing them (*dāraḵ,* Mic. 6:15; possibly alluded to in Dt. 33:24).

Oil is mentioned as one of the necessities of life. Flour and oil were the only foodstuffs of the widow in Zarephath (1 K. 17:12; cf. vv. 14,16); in a similar situation 2 K. 4:2 mentions only oil. As the regulations governing offerings show, flour *(sōleṯ)* was mixed *(bll)* with oil to bake bread, or flatbread was spread with oil (e.g., Lev. 2:4). Thus Yahweh feeds the foundling Jerusalem with choice flour, oil, and honey (Ezk. 16:13,19); according to Nu. 11:8, the Israelites used manna to make flat cakes of bread, which tasted like cakes baked in oil *(lᵉšaḏ haššemen).* Stores of wine, fruit, and oil, or wheat, barley, oil, and honey, are mentioned in Jer. 40:10 and 41:8; according to 1 Ch. 12:41, flour, fig cakes and raisin cakes, wine, oil, oxen, and sheep were brought to David at Hebron.

Consequently oil is one of the most important products of the soil, which attests to God's blessing: "He fed them with produce of the field, he nursed them with wine from the crags, with oil from flinty rock" (Dt. 32:13; cf. v. 14: curds, milk, fat, flour; also Dt. 8:8). Oil was thus among the mostly highly prized gifts of God (cf. Hos. 2:10[Eng. 8], using *yiṣhār*).

Oil was also used to anoint the body and hair. "Oil to make the face shine" is one of the gifts of the Creator (Ps. 104:15, along with wine and bread). One result of the curse is that people will not be able to anoint themselves *(sûḵ)* even though they have olive trees (Dt. 28:40; cf. the punishment threatened in Mic. 6:15). The foundling Jerusalem

14. *AHw,* III, 1157-58.
15. *KAI* 186.3; 187.2-3; *DISO,* 278.
16. V. Sasson, *JSS* 26 (1981) 1-5; L. E. Stager, *JSS* 28 (1983) 241-45.

is washed and anointed with oil (Ezk. 16:9). According to Ps. 23:5, God is like an innkeeper who anoints the head of a guest. Conversely, it is a sign of mourning that the widow from Tekoa does not anoint herself with oil (2 S. 14:2). Cant. 1:3 and 4:10 speak of the fragrance *(rēaḥ)* of oil, undoubtedly a reference to perfumed oil. The same is probably true in the case of the *rē'šîṯ šᵉmānîm* at the banquets of the Samaritan women in Am. 6:6, and possibly in Ezk. 23:41, which speaks of incense and oil in conjunction with a spread table. The *šmn rḥṣ* mentioned on ostraca[17] probably also belongs here, as does the "fresh *(ra'ᵃnān)* oil" (probably "newly pressed") of Ps. 92:11b(10b).[18] Metaphorical use in Isa. 1:6 attests to the employment of *šemen* as a medicament: the nation's wounds have not been softened *(rkk)* with oil, i.e., the people have experienced no easing of their affliction.

Oil was also used as a fuel for lamps, particularly the lamp in the tent of meeting (Ex. 27:20; cf. 25:6; 35:8,14; 39:37; Nu. 4:16; Zec. 4:2,12), and to dress shields (2 S. 1:21).[19] Trading in oil is mentioned in Ezk. 27:17; 1 K. 5:25(11); Hos. 12:2(1).

3. *Cultic Use.* Oil is used in two ways in the cult: as a component of offerings, and in the anointing of kings and priests.

a. *Offerings.* The grain offering consists either of choice flour on which oil is poured (Lev. 2:2; similarly for the offering of firstfruits, 2:15) or bread (rings or flat cakes) prepared with oil (2:4-7; for other instances of *minḥâ* see Lev. 6:8[15]; 7:10; 9:3; Nu. 15:4,6,9; Ezk. 45:24-25; 46:14-15).[20]

b. *Anointing.* When a king was anointed, oil was poured[21] on his head (1 S. 10:1; 2 K. 9:3; a flask or horn of oil is mentioned in 1 S. 16:1,13; 1 K. 1:39; 2 K. 9:1). Ps. 45:8(7) ("he has anointed you with the oil of gladness") probably refers to this act.[22]

Texts dealing with the anointing of priests (or the high priest) often associate *māšaḥ* with *qdš* piel, "consecrate": the anointed individual is transposed into the divine sphere of holiness,[23] and the oil is *šemen qōḏeš,* "oil of holiness, holy oil" (Nu. 35:25). Usually, however, it is called *šemen mišḥâ,* "anointing oil" (Ex. 29:7,21; Lev. 8:2,12,30; 21:10). For the high priest we may also cite Ezk. 29:7 and Lev. 8:10,12; for priests in general, Ex. 28:41; 30:30; 40:15 (without *šemen*); Lev. 7:16; 10:7. Both the ark and the tent of meeting are also anointed with oil (Ex. 30:25,31; 40:9).[24]

c. *Leprosy.* Finally, we note that oil was used in the offerings purifying those who had been healed of leprosy (Lev. 14:10,12,15-18,21,26,29).

17. See I.4 above.
18. On the latter see S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 13 (1981) 302.
19. A. R. Millard, *BASOR* 230 (1978) 70.
20. → מנחה *minḥâ.*
21. → יצק *yāṣaq.*
22. For the theological significance of this anointing → משח *māšaḥ.*
23. → קדש *qdš.*
24. For further discussion → משח *māšaḥ.*

III. *ʿēṣ šemen.* The compound *ʿēṣ šemen* denotes a species of tree (Isa. 41:19; Neh. 8:13; Sir. 50:10) or the wood obtained from it (1 K. 6:23,31-33). It may be identified either with the oleaster *(Eleagnus hortensis)* or a resinous conifer.[25]

IV. 1. *šāmān.* In Isaac's blessing on Jacob, he prays that God may give him of the dew of heaven and of the *šᵉmannê hāʾāreṣ* (Gen. 27:28), which may mean either fat (fertile) land ("fat of the earth")[26] or land watered by rain and therefore fertile.[27]

2. *šāmēn.* The adj. *šāmen* means "fat" or "fertile." Fat animals are strong and can drive out the weak (Ezk. 34:16, metaphorically distinguishing different groups among the people, which will experience God as a good shepherd; cf. v. 3, where *bārîʾ* is used with the same meaning). The word can describe a fertile land (Nu. 13:20; Neh. 9:25,35) or good, rich pasturage (Ezk. 34:14; 1 Ch. 4:40); it can also describe bread as the produce of the ground (Isa. 30:23 with *dāšēn;* cf. Gen. 49:20 in the blessing of Asher), a portion of the spoil (Hab. 1:16), and Moab's well-fed, able-bodied men (Jgs. 3:29, *ʾîš ḥāyil*).

V. Verb. The verb appears in the qal in the Song of Moses, describing the well-fed and therefore arrogant people ("Jeshurun") (Dt. 32:15: "you grew fat, bloated [*ʿāḇâ*], and gorged [*kāśâ*]"). It is used similarly in Jer. 5:27-28 with reference to Israel ("they have become great [*gdl*] and rich [*ʿšr* hiphil], fat and sleek [*ʿšt*]"). The hiphil appears in the inaugural vision of Isaiah: "Make the heart of this people fat [= 'harden it'], stop [*kbd* hiphil, lit. 'make heavy'] their ears, and shut (*šʿʿ* hiphil) their eyes," so that they will be unable to accept the prophet's message (Isa. 6:10; cf. Kellenberger, who considers this obduracy to be positive). In Nehemiah's penitential prayer, we find simply "become fat": "They ate and were filled and became fat, and lived well; nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against you [God]" (Neh. 9:25-26). Thus "become fat" tends to take on a sense of self-satisfaction, arrogance, and apostasy (cf. *mārâ* hiphil and *māraḏ* in Neh. 9:26).

VI. 1. *LXX.* The LXX normally uses *élaion* to translate *šemen* (141 times); it uses *mýron* 7 times, and occasionally other words. The verb is rendered by *esthíein, lipaínein,* or *pachýnein,* depending on the context. For *šāmān* we find *piótēs;* for *šāmēn píōn* and *liparós/lipaínein* (twice untranslated).

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The Temple Scroll from Qumran has more than 20 occurrences of *šemen.* Some have to do with the festival of oil (11QT 21:12–23:9), others with the use of oil at other festivals (18:6; 20:1-3), still others with its use in offerings. The festival of oil, which may also be mentioned in 4Q327 1 2:7 and 4Q327 2 2:8 *(mwʿd hšmn),* is described in the Temple Scroll as a ritual of firstfruits, during which the new oil is

25. E. I. Löw, *Flora der Juden,* I (Vienna, 1926), 590; III (1924), 46; M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 101; K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 167.

26. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 441.

27. H.-J. Zobel, *ZAW* 82 (1970) 209-16. See I.2 above.

consecrated (*yiṣhār,* 11QT 21:16; 22:16; *šemen,* 21:14-15; 22:15; cf. also 45:10,15). Oil appears as an element of the grain offering in 15:10; 18:10; 24:5; 34:13. The purity of oil is mentioned in 47:6 (cf. the association of oil with holiness in 47:12; 49:12).

The War Scroll stipulates that the priests must not allow themselves to be defiled by the blood of the slain and must not "desecrate the oil of their anointing, since they are holy" (1QM 9:8; cf. similarly 4QM[c] 1:5). The oil used to anoint priests is also mentioned in 4Q375 1 1:9. The enthronement of the king is alluded to in 11QPs[a] 28:11 (Samuel's anointing of David) and 4Q458 2 2:6 ("anointed with the oil of kingship"). In describing the promised land, 4Q378 11 6 follows Dt. 8:7-9.

Ringgren

שָׁמַע *šāmaʿ;* שֵׁמַע *šēmaʿ;* שְׁמוּעָה *šᵉmûʿâ*

I. Etymology. II. Meaning and Construction: 1. With Accusative Object; 2. With *ʾel;* 3. With *bᵉ;* 4. With *lᵉ.* III. Figurative Usage. IV. Juridical Usage. V. Imperatives. VI. The Law of Yahweh: 1. *tôrâ;* 2. *miṣwâ.* VII. Deuteronomy. VIII. Wisdom. IX. Niphal. X. Hiphil. XI. Piel. XII. Nominal Derivatives. XIII. LXX. XIV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāmaʿ. J. Arambarri, "Hören," *NBL,* II (1992), 175-76; idem, *Der Wortstamm "hören" im AT. SBB* 20 (1990); H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung* (Wiesbaden, 1957), esp. 131-34; idem, "Das hörende Herz," *TLZ* 79 (1954) 697-700 = *Das hörende Herz. OBO* 80 (1988), 3-5; J.-L. Cunchillos, "Genèse 17,20 et KTU 2.10:5-7," *RB* 92 (1985) 375-82; M. Delcor, "Les attaches littéraires, l'origine et la signification de l'expression biblique 'Prendre à témoin le ciel et la terre,'" *VT* 16 (1966) 8-25; A. K. Fenz, *Auf Jahwes Stimme hören. WBTh* 6 (1964); M. Görg, *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten. BWANT* 105 (1975), esp. 82-99; J. Halbe, "'Gemeinschaft, die Welt unterbricht,'" in N. Lohfink, ed., *Deuteronomium. BETL* 68 (1985) 55-75; Y. Hoffmann, "Two Opening Formulae in Biblical Style," *Tarbiz* 46 (1976/77) 157-80; P. Kanyamachumbi, "Écouter Yahweh à fin de réussir" (diss., Rome, 1964); B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "Synästhesien im biblischen Althebräisch in Übersetzung und Auslegung," *ZAH* 1 (1988) 147-58, esp. 151-52; M. C. A. Korpel, *Rift in the Clouds. UBL* 8 (1990), esp. 140-41; H.-J. Kraus, "Hören und Sehen in der althebräischen Tradition," *Studium Generale* 19 (1966) 115-23 = *Biblisch-theologische Aufsätze* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972), 84-101; P. Kuhn, *Offenbarungsstimmen im Antiken Judentum. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 20 (Tübingen, 1989); I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949), esp. 13-14, 53-54; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Address 'Listen' in the Ugaritic Epic and the Bible," in G. Rendsburg et al., eds., *Bible World. FS C. H. Gordon* (New York, 1980), 123-31; W. R. Mayer, "'Ich rufe dich von ferne, höre mich von nahe!'" in R. Albertz et al., eds., *Werden und Wirken des ATs. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 302-17; F. K. Mayr, "Hören," *RAC,* XV (1991), 1023-1111, esp. 1034-35, 1063-74; E. Mørstad, *Wenn du der Stimme des Herrn, deines Gottes gehorchen wirst* (Oslo, 1960); P. K. D. Newman, *Hört das Wort Jahwäs. Schriften der Stiftung Europa-Kolleg* 30 (Hamburg, 1975); M. Rothenberg, *"šimʿû ʿammîm kullām," BethM* 24 (1978/79) 266-68; R. Schlichting, "Hören," *LexÄg,* II, 1232-35; J. Schreiner, "Hören auf Gott und sein Wort in der Sicht des Deuteronomiums," *ErfThSt* 12 (1962), 27-47; H. Schult, "שמע *šmʿ* to hear," *TLOT,* III, 1375-80.

I. Etymology. The root *šmʿ* is also found in Hebrew outside the OT. It appears in the Lachish ostraca[1] in the expression *yšmʿ yhwh ʾt ʾdny šmʿt šlm* (or *šmʿt ṭb* or *šmʿt šlm wṭb*), "May Yahweh cause my lord to hear tidings of well-being" (or "tidings of good" or "tidings of well-being and good"), usually with the addition of *ʿt kym*, "this very day."[2] This salutation formula differs from that in the Arad ostraca.[3] In the ostracon of Yavneh-yam,[4] the petitioner uses *šmʿ* to request a hearing. An idiom common in OT Hebrew appears in a papyrus from Wadi Murabbaʿat (ca. 700 B.C.E. [?]: *ʾl tšmʿ lk[l dbr] ʾšr ydbr ʾlyk*.[5] The verb is also found in Middle Hebrew and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The G stem of Akk. *šemû(m)* means "hear, learn, give a hearing (also in legal usage), follow, obey (with *ana* or a direct object), understand language"; with a deity it can also mean "hear (a prayer) favorably."[6] The derivative *šāmeʾānu*, "earwitness," is rare.[7]

In Mesopotamian literature we find phenomena that recall the structural use of the vb. *šāmaʿ* in the literary forms of the OT.[8] In a fragment of an Old Babylonian epic, for example,[9] the author addresses his public directly with the words: "I will sing a song of Bēlet-ilī — friends, attend! Warriors, hearken! *(qú-ra-du ši-me-a)*."[10] The initial stich has a formal parallel in an Ugaritic text: *ʾšr nkl wib*, "Let me sing of Nikkalu-and-Ibbu,"[11] which also recalls the beginning of the *Iliad: mē̆nin áeide theá Pēlēiádeō Achilē̆os.*

An appeal to hear also appears in the introduction to a speech in the Babylonian Theodicy;[12] the afflicted speaker begins: "My friend, your mind is a river whose spring never fails, / The accumulated mass of the sea, which knows no decrease. / I will ask you a question; listen to what I say. / Pay attention for a moment; hear my words *(ši-me qa-ba-a-a)*."[13]

Such an appeal for attention appears also in conversations among the gods, as in the Erra Epic: "Ishum opened his mouth and spoke, / he said to the hero Erra, / 'Hero, be attentive, hear my words *(ši-me qa-ba-a-a)*.'"[14] A similar appeal may also appear in Neo-Assyrian prophecy.[15]

---

1. *KAI* 192.1; 193.2; 194.1; 195.1; 197.1.
2. H.-P. Müller, *UF* 2 (1970) 234-35 n. 62.
3. M. Weippert, *VT* 25 (1975) 202-12.
4. *KAI* 200.1.
5. D. Pardee et al., *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (1982), 120, no. 3.36, 2.
6. *AHw*, III, 1211-13.
7. *AHw*, III, 1156.
8. K. Hecker, *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik. AOAT* Sonderreihe 8 (1974), 177-78.
9. *CT* 15 1 i 1-2.
10. C. Wilcke, *ZA* 67 (1977) 153-216.
11. *KTU* 1.24, 1; J. C. de Moor, *Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Nisaba* 16 (Leiden, 1987), 142.
12. *BWL*, 63-91.
13. Ll. 23-26, pp. 72-73; cf. W. von Soden, *TUAT*, III, 147-48. Cf. the similar appeal, though without *šemû*, in ll. 265-66.
14. V, 16-17; cf. ll. 4-5; L. Cagni, *The Poem of Erra. SANE*, I/3 (1977), 58.
15. M. Nissinen, *Prophetie, Redaktion und Fortschreibung im Lichte von Hosea 4 und 11. AOAT* 251 (1991), 137.

The exhortations to hear in Deuteronomy and Dtr literature are rooted in covenant theology, against the legal background of contracts and treaties. Of interest in this context is the appearance of *šemû(m)* in international treaties. K. Watanabe, the new editor of the treaties of Esarhaddon, has found nine further occurrences of the verb;[16] none of the passages uses *šemû(m)* to enjoin observance of the treaty obligations.

Watanabe interprets ll. 188-97, cited by Fenz,[17] differently than does Wiseman,[18] on whom Fenz depends. The text threatens what will happen if words of the successor to the throne are not heeded; cf. also l. 12 of the treaty between Esarhaddon and Baal of Tyre.[19] The Code of Hammurabi uses *šemû* to enjoin observance of the legal code.[20]

Form-critical comparison of Dt. 28 with ancient Near Eastern treaties leads Mørstad to conclude: *šāmaʿ bᵉ* in Dt. 28:1 corresponds "functionally to Hitt. *paḫs-*, Akk. *naṣāru; lōʾ šmʿ b . . .* to Hitt. *šarr-*, Akk. *lā naṣāru*. In other words: *šmʿ b* = 'observe punctiliously, obey' (legal diction, not parenetic 'hear willingly')."[21] But one may well ask whether the parallel to the formulas in the treaties is not found instead in *šmr* and *ʿśh* in Dt. 28:1.

The Ugaritic vb. *šmʿ* has the meaning "hear" and the secondary sense "obey."[22] The evidence shows that the Ugaritic gods hear the prayers of mortals.[23] To the juridical domain probably belongs the office of "auditor (of legal matters)," Ugar. *šmʿ rgm*.[24]

Loewenstamm points out that appeals to hear are also found in Ugaritic myths and epics, e.g., *šmʿ l ngr il il[š] ngr bt bʿl w ʾṯtk ngrt ilht*, "Listen, O Ilishu, herald of Ilu; / Ilishu, herald of the house of *Baʿlu*, / and (let listen) your wife, the heraldess of the goddesses."[25] It is particularly noteworthy that the exhortation stands at the beginning of a rhetorical unit.

The verb is also attested in Phoenician and Punic.[26] In one text *šmʿ ql* is used for the hearing of a prayer;[27] these words appear frequently in Phoenician and Punic inscriptions, often alongside a reference to a blessing. The expression *šmʿ bdbr* has parallels in OT usage.[28]

In the Old Aramaic Sefire inscription[29] the verb occurs in the sense of "obey"; the context shows that it refers to observing the conditions of an international treaty.[30] There

---

16. K. Watanabe, *Baghdader Mitteilungen*, Beiheft 3 (1987); for a comparison with texts in Deuteronomy see R. Frankena, *OTS* 14 (1965) 122-54.

17. Pp. 77-78.

18. D. J. Wiseman, *Iraq* 20 (1958) 43-44.

19. R. Borger, *TUAT*, I, 158-59.

20. CH, XLVIII, 3ff.; cf. Fenz, 75; Borger, *TUAT*, I, 76-77.

21. P. 13.

22. *UT*, no. 2441.

23. *KTU* 1.119 34; 1.93 5; cf. Korpel, 140.

24. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *TUAT*, I, 218.

25. *KTU* 1.16 IV, 10-12; de Moor, *Anthology*, 218.

26. *DISO*, 309-10.

27. *KAI* 10.3,8.

28. *KAI* 14.6.

29. *KAI* 222B.21-22; 223B.2,2′,3-4.

30. See II.3.b below.

is a parallel to Hebrew usage in another text,[31] where the hearing of sounds is expressed by the words *w'l ytšmʿ ql knr,* "and the sound of the lyre is heard no more." The hearing of a prayer is described by the expression *wlmšmʿ tṣlwth,* "for the hearing of his prayer," in l. 9 of the Aramaic Fekheriye inscription.[32] The Akkadian equivalent is *ikribiya ana šeme.*[33] In Aramaic the person heard appears as the direct object[34] or is introduced by *lᵉ*.[35] An exhortation to hear (a *šmʿ* imperative clause, to use Neumann's terminology) occurs in the Deir ʿAlla inscription.[36] Although the text is uncertain, it is noteworthy that this form appears in a prophetic text outside the OT.

Arab. *samiʿa* means "hear" (with a broad spectrum of meanings). The same is true of Eth. *samʿa.*[37] Nominal derivatives have the meaning "testimony," a sense that Barth and Driver claim is shared by the Hebrew root.[38] The OSA vb. *smʿ* means "hear, obey," and in juristic contexts "bear witness"; the noun *smʿ,* "witness, evidence."[39] Modern South Arabic (Jibbāli) *smʿ* also means "hear, obey."[40]

Naturally the verb is found in Jewish Aramaic;[41] it appears also in Syriac (*šᵉmaʿ,* "hear, understand, obey").[42] A relationship with Egyp. *śḏm*[43] and Copt. *sōt(e)m* are judged to be extremely uncertain.[44]

Despite Vycichl's negative conclusions, the notions associated with the concept of "hearing" in Egyptian are of interest in the context of OT anthropology.[45] "Hearing plays an essential role in the educational process that transforms an individual, a learner, into a person 'truly silent' *(sgr mȝʿ)* and thus into an important member of Egyptian society, in both the social and private domain."[46] This is clear, for example, in the Instruction of Ptah-hotep: "Hearing is profitable for a son who hears, / for hearing penetrates into the hearer, / making the hearer obedient. . . . / One whom God loves can hear, / but one whom God rejects cannot hear. It is the heart that makes its possessor one who hears or one who does not hear. . . . / As to the fool who refuses to hear, / for him nothing is done. . . . / He lives on what brings death, / and his food is perverse speech. / His character is well known to the ministers, / and they say daily, 'a dead man

31. *KAI* 222A.29.

32. A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, and A. P. Millard, *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne. Études assyriologiques* (Paris, 1982), 23.

33. Additional citations in *AHw,* I, 370.

34. Ahiqar 59 (*AP,* 214).

35. B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt,* I (Jerusalem, 1986), A.6.8, 3.

36. I, 12; see the new translation by J. Hoftijzer, *TUAT,* II, 138-48.

37. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 501-2.

38. See IV below.

39. Beeston, 128.

40. T. M. Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon* (Oxford, 1981), 262.

41. Data concerning construction with an object in Beyer, 714.

42. Data on construction in *LexSyr,* 786-87.

43. *WbÄS,* IV, 384.

44. W. Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Copte* (Louvain, 1983), 199.

45. See the foundational works of Brunner.

46. Schlichting, 1232.

in a living body.' / His afflictions are ignored on account of the great misfortune that befalls him every day."[47]

The ideas illustrated by this example suggest a connection with the OT concept of *lēḇ šōmēaʿ* ("a hearing heart" [NRSV "an understanding mind"], 1 K. 3:9); the equivalent expression is actually found in Egyptian.[48] The motto "it is good for people to hear" appears frequently in ancient Egyptian literature.[49] The significance of hearing in Egypt goes beyond education and character formation: hearing as a vehicle for understanding is a precondition for civilization. The interruption of communication is associated with chaos. Thus the verses of the second strophe of the Dispute of a Man with His Ba all begin with the question, "To whom shall I speak today?" The strophe as a whole describes the breakdown of society.[50]

Religious language also describes the gods as hearing human petitions. For example, Horus has the attribute *ḳn m śḏm*, "mighty in hearing." The concept can also be hypostatized. The hearing of petitions also appears in the administrative realm, as a function of the vizier.[51]

II. Meaning and Construction. Social interaction takes place primarily in the form of linguistic communication; without language, speech, and hearing, the constitution of human society is inconceivable.[52] This explains why suspension of hearing or refusal to hear is associated with chaos. Besides the Egyptian example,[53] for the OT we may cite Gen. 11:7: Yahweh dissolves the human society that is attempting to build the tower of Babel by making communication impossible: the people can no longer understand one another (*šāmaʿ;* the verb also has this meaning elsewhere, e.g., Gen. 42:23; Dt. 28:49; 2 K. 18:26//Isa. 36:11; Jer. 5:15; Ezk. 3:6).

Dt. 21:18-21 decrees the death penalty for someone who refused to listen to his parents (*šāmaʿ*, twice in v. 18); the pitiless harshness of the sentence points to the antisocial nature of the offense, which endangers society. The same conduct is also denoted by *mrh*[54] and *srr*.[55] From the positive perspective, wisdom elevates hearing to an ideal.[56]

---

47. H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit* (Zurich, 1988), 129-30.

48. Brunner, *Hörende Herz*, 4-5.

49. Shipwrecked Sailor, 182 (M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, I [Berkeley, 1973], 225); Dispute of a Man with His Ba, 67-68 (ibid., 165).

50. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, I, 166-68; J. Assmann, "Königsdogma und Heilserwartung," in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen, 1983), 345-77, esp. 356-57; extensive presentation in idem, *Ma'at* (1990), 69-85.

51. Schlichting, 1234.

52. For further discussion from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, see P. L. Berger and T. Luckman, *Social Construction of Reality* (1966, repr. New York, 1980), 33-43.

53. See I above.

54. → IX, 7.

55. → X, 355.

56. See VIII below.

Hearing is critical for the interaction between God and human beings; the medium through which God makes his will known among his people (in commandments or mediated by the prophets) is the audible word. Interruption of this communication has consequences: Israel's refusal to hear served as grounds for the punishment of the exile.[57] Conversely, Dt. 4:28 and Ps. 115:4-7 heap scorn on a god who cannot hear human beings. To exaggerate the point: one who cannot hear does not exist; one who can no longer hear, no longer communicate, is doomed (Ps. 38:14-15[Eng. 13-14]).

The vb. *šāmaʿ* appears frequently in OT Hebrew; the count varies between 1,159 occurrences[58] and 1,157.[59] Statistics of occurrences in the individual books may be found elsewhere.[60] As a verb of perception, *šāmaʿ* appears occasionally alongside *rāʾâ*.[61] The vb. *ʾzn* is a synonym.

The way in which the (trans.) vb. *šāmaʿ* is constructed with its object in particular contexts is highly significant for its meaning.[62]

Schult speaks of "the great variety of constructions with *šmʿ*, whose fine distinctions are not always clear."[63] Arambarri, by contrast, makes a serious attempt to detail the differences among the various prepositional constructions.

When constructed with a preposition, *šāmaʿ* usually means "hear" in the sense of "hear favorably, accede." This type of figurative usage is found not only among the Semitic languages[64] but also among the Indo-European languages. It appears to be an example of a widespread anthropological phenomenon, in which "see" can be used metaphorically in the sense of "understand," whereas verbs of hearing can be used in the sense of "hearken, obey."

When *šāmaʿ* is constructed with a nonprepositional object (about a third of the time[65]), it serves to denote sensory perception, the perception of an audible signal. The meaning is somewhat different when the object of *šāmaʿ* is *dāḇār:* then "hearing becomes not the perception of sounds but the recognition of words and their meaning; this recognition engenders a correct relation to the words."[66]

In view of the wealth of occurrences of *šāmaʿ*, it is not surprising that attempts to differentiate the word's various uses do not totally achieve their goal. For example, the expression *šāmaʿ ʾeṯ-deḇar yhwh* in 1 K. 12:24//2 Ch. 11:4 means "hearken to Yahweh's word" with the connotation of obedience.[67] We also note the use of the same expression

---

57. See VII below.

58. *BDB*, 1033; Even-Shoshan, 2186-96; Schult, 1375; Aramabarri, *Wortstamm*, 11-12; *HAL*, II, 1570-74.

59. *KBL*², 990-91; cited by Fenz, 22.

60. Schult, 1375; also Fenz, 25-39; Arambarri, *Wortstamm*, passim.

61. → XIII, 213.

62. For detailed analysis see *BDB*, 1033-34; Arambarri, *Wortstamm*, passim.

63. P. 1377.

64. See I above.

65. Arambarri, *Wortstamm*, 180.

66. Ibid., 230.

67. O. Eissfeldt, *HSAT*, I, 523; J. Gray, *I and II Kings*. *OTL* (²1970), 309; W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*. *HAT* I/21 (1955), 230. Arambarri, *Wortstamm*, 223, 246, understands it differently.

with *mṣwt* as object in Jgs. 2:17; 3:4; Jer. 35:14. The connotation of obedience may be present not only when people heed Yahweh but also when the object is another human being, as in Josh. 1:18,[68] where Joshua functions as the mediator of divine commands.

Although in the prepositional construction of *šāma'* the prevalent meaning is clearly "heed, obey," there is no rule without its exception in the use of this verb. In 2 S. 19:36(35) *šāma' b^eqôl šārîm* means "listen to the voice of the singers"; Arambarri suggests an intensified sensory perception with overtones of "enjoy," but this is still quite different from "obey."[69]

1. *With Accusative Object.* a. *General.* The meaning "here" (in the sense of auditory perception) is present when the object specifies what is heard. For example, *šāma' ('eṯ) qôl* (54 times[70]) means "hear a sound/noise/voice." In this expression *qôl* almost never stands alone; it is usually associated with an enclitic personal pronoun or a construct phrase in which the *nomen rectum* identifies the source of the sound or describes it more closely (Gen. 3:8,10; 4:13; Ex. 32:17-18; Lev. 5:1; 1 S. 4:6,14; 15:14; 2 S. 5:24; 1 K. 1:45; 14:6; Jer. 9:9[10]; Ezk. 3:12; *qôl šôpār:* Josh. 6:5; 2 S. 15:10; 1 K. 1:41; Jer. 4:19,21; 42:14; Ezk. 33:4-5; Neh. 4:14).

This usage of *qôl* leaves the impression that it functions as a neutral expletive: cf. *šāma' qôl diḇrê* (Dt. 1:34; 4:12; 5:28; Dnl. 10:9; see also 1 S. 15:1; Ps. 103:20) with *šāma' diḇrê* (Gen. 27:34; 1 S. 17:11; etc. [ca. 90 times[71]]) and *šāma' qôl 'ālâ* (Lev. 5:1) with *šāma' 'ālâ* (Prov. 29:24). Clearly the same is true when we compare Job 33:1 with 33:8.

This last example shows that *šāma'* + object refers to auditory perception without any necessary implication of approval or acceptance of what is heard on the part of the hearer. In v. 8 Elihu states that he has indeed heard the sound of Job's discourse; in v. 12, however, after quoting Job's own words in vv. 9-11, he rejects what Job has said.

Like *qôl, dāḇār* can also function grammatically as a neutral expletive, at least across a substantial range of usage.[72] "The speaker can be perceived only through his or her words. The actual person is not an object of perception, but only the word or words."[73] The expression *šāma' 'eṯ-diḇrê* + person appears in Gen. 24:30; 27:34; 31:1; 39:19; Jgs. 9:30; 1 S. 8:21; 17:11; 24:10(9); 1 K. 5:21(7); 2 K. 19:16. That *dāḇār* can serve grammatically as a kind of neutral expletive is clear from the appeals to be heard that have only an enclitic pronoun as object: "Hear us, my lord" (Gen. 23:6,8,11,13,15; 1 Ch. 28:2; 2 Ch. 15:2; 20:2; 28:11; 29:5). "These expressions function like 'Please' in modern discourse."[74] This type of construction appears primarily in late texts.[75]

68. But cf. *BHS*.
69. Pp. 35-36.
70. Arambarri, *Wortstamm*, 183-92.
71. Ibid., 197-203.
72. Ibid., 198.
73. Ibid., 200.
74. Ibid., 228.
75. Ibid., 228-29.

The object of *šāmaʿ* can also be *diḇrê (sēp̱er) hattôrâ* (2 K. 22:11//2 Ch. 34:19; Neh. 8:9). These texts refer to the auditory perception of the *tôrâ* recitation.

The object of *šāmaʿ* can also be a subordinate clause, introduced by *kî* or *ʾašer.* "שמע כי expresses a unique deictic cognizance of a report or message. A list, an entire message, or a universally acknowledged act or truth is expressed by שמע אשר."[76]

There is a subtle point in 1 S. 25:24; 26:19; 2 S. 20:17, where the imperative or jussive of *šmʿ* appeals to someone else to hear. When a person of lower rank addresses someone of higher rank, linguistic usage is conditioned by the situation: in accordance with the rules of etiquette, one can ask a king or high official only to be heard acoustically, not directly to be heard favorably, not to mention obeyed. There is evidence[77] that this usage was the norm in official communication.[78]

b. *God Hears Humans.* This principle is also at work in the Psalter when Yahweh is called on to hear or thanked for a favorable hearing. The vb. *šāmaʿ* (by itself or with an accusative object) appears primarily in those genres where an individual addresses Yahweh.

There are parallels to this usage in Mesopotamian prayers, e.g., in prayers belonging to the series Lifting of the Hand.[79] Prayer 50:21 reads: "The raising of my hand accept! Hearken to my prayer!"[80] The similarity to Ps. 28:2 is noteworthy: "Hear the sound of my supplication, as I cry to you, as I lift up *(nśʾ)* my hands toward your most holy sanctuary."

Two groups of texts emerge clearly. God is asked to hear when the psalm speaks of God's help in the morning. According to McKay,[81] the "Israelite association of dawn with the saving epiphany of God"[82] is displayed by Ps. 5, 17, 27, 30, 57, 59, 63, and 143.[83] In 5:4(3); 17:1; 27:7; 30:11(10); 143:1, *šāmaʿ* is used to ask God for a hearing. It is also worth considering whether 4:2,4(1,3); 6:9-10(8-9); 18:7(6)(cf. v. 29[28]//2 S. 22:7); 54:4(2) also belong in this category. A crucial element is the expression of confidence in being heard (4:2,4[1,3]; 5:3-4[2-3]; 6:7,9-10[6,8-9]; 17:1,3,6; 18:7,29[6,28]; 30:6,11-12[5,10-11]). The analysis of Janowski[84] probably cuts the ground from under earlier interpretations of these psalms, which situate them solely and entirely within the context of the cult (investigative detention in the temple, asylum in the sanctuary, God as judge)[85] (but cf. Ps. 5).

---

76. Ibid., 255.

77. *KAI* 200.1.

78. See IV below.

79. See the examples in L. W. King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery, being "The Prayers of the Lifting of the Hand"* (1896, repr. York Beach, 2000), 177; W. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen "Gebetsbeschörungen." StPohl.* Series maior 5 (1976), 216-17; Mayer, "Ich rufe," 302ff.

80. King.

81. J. W. McKay, *ZAW* 91 (1979) 229-47.

82. P. 229.

83. On the religio-historical background of this notion see B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils. WMANT* 59 (1989).

84. Pp. 180-91.

85. Still maintained by Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 212-14.

The psalms of the other group, which usually speak of the psalmist's having been heard by God (22:25[24]; 61:2[1]; 66:18-19; 116:1), involve the payment of vows. Both perspectives are present in Ps. 65. The same language appears also in 10:17; 31:23(22); 34:7,18(6,17); 39:13(12); 40:2(1); 64:2(1); 84:9(8); 102:2(1); 106:44; 119:149; 145:19; Lam. 3:56; Sir. 36:22; 51:11.

Although in communication with God the construction of *šāmaʿ* with the accusative is commonest, the prepositional construction also occurs, with *b^e^* (Ps. 103:2), *l^e^* (61:6[5]), and *'el* (69:34[33]).

The vb. *šāmaʿ* is also used with nonprepositional objects outside the Psalter when Yahweh hears an individual or an appeal, as in Ex. 3:7 (J) (with *ṣ^eʿ^āqâ*);[86] a similar formulation appears in Ex. 22:22(23) (cf. v. 26[27]), an early redaction of the Covenant Code.[87] In Nu. 20:16 (E?) we find *šāmaʿ qôl;*[88] in Ex. 2:24 and 6:5 (P) the object is *n^e'^āqâ.* According to Ex. 16:7-9,12 (P), God heard the complaining *(t^e^lunnôṯ)* of the Israelites, with positive results; in this context, too, "hear" has the sense of "hear favorably." Nu. 14:27b, where God threatens punishment upon hearing Israel complaining, is secondary.[89]

Dtr in origin are 1 K. 8:45,49 and 9:3 (the perfect forms in 9:3 should probably be understood as coincident[90]); cf. also 8:38-39, where Yahweh hears (with favor) prayer and plea *(t^e^pillâ* and *t^e^ḥinnâ).* In the preceding vv. 28-30, by contrast, *šāmaʿ* is constructed with *'el.*

Arambarri's attempt to explain this change from *šāmaʿ 'el* to *šāmaʿ 'eṯ* seems artificial: "This change of preposition is due to a shift from a favorable hearing to sensory perception; prayers are no longer spoken in the temple but toward the temple, in places of prayer outside Jerusalem. . . . In other words, even if a prayer is spoken far away, God will hear it."[91] Here we must note 1 K. 9:3, a verse that refers back to 8:22-26,28:[92] in v. 28 Yahweh's hearing of Solomon's prayer and plea is constructed with *'el.* In short, the change from a prepositional to a nonprepositional object with *šāmaʿ* can be due to stylistic variation with a possible diachronic aspect: 8:44-51 is a later expansion, distinct from its context.

The expression *šāmaʿ ('eṯ) t^e^pillâ* for a favorable hearing of prayer appears also in 2 K. 20:5 and Prov. 15:29; in Jon. 2:3(2) we find the construction with *qôl;* cf. also Neh. 9:9 and 2 Ch. 33:13. In Gen. 17:20; Jer. 7:16; Ezk. 8:18; Mic. 7:7; Job 22:27, *šāmaʿ ('eṯ)* with a pronominal suffix is used for the favorable hearing of an individual's prayer.

---

86. See the analysis by W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus I: 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 100-110, 120, 159-64.

87. J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 114 (1975), 426-44, 451-59; E. Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründigungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. StBib* 3 (1988), 38-42; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch. BZAW* 188 (1990), 331-59.

88. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1968), 149-50.

89. Ibid., 110.

90. G. H. Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, I. *NCBC* (1984), 210.

91. Pp. 147-48.

92. E. Würthwein, *Könige II: 1.Kön. 17–2.Kön. 25. ATD* XI/1 (1984), 105.

In imperatives, too, the construction of *šāma'* with the accusative can have observance as the intended result.[93]

2. *With 'el.* a. *General.* Although *šāma'* can also mean "hear" in the sense of "hear favorably" when constructed with the so-called accusative object (a construction evolved from the way one addresses a person of higher status), this meaning is present more clearly in the construction formulated with *'el.*

Arambarri summarizes the construction with *'el* as follows: "Assent, consent, acceptance, agreement, approval, rejection — these are some of the concepts that can be used to render שמע אל. If the assent is made binding by social religious ties, the translation 'obey' is appropriate. But if it is God who assents, the meaning is 'hear favorably, grant.'"[94]

Many of the 105 instances of this construction have a personal object. The noun *miṣwâ* figures among the impersonal objects; but construction of the expression elsewhere with *lᵉ* (Neh. 9:29), *'el* (Dt. 11:13,27-28; 28:13; Neh. 9:16), and an accusative object (Jgs. 2:17; 3:4; Jer. 35:14)[95] shows how little effect the use of different prepositions has on meaning.[96]

b. *God Hears Humans.* In Gen. 16:11; 21:17; 30:17,22; Dt. 3:26; 9:19; 10:10; Jgs. 9:7; 1 K. 8:52;[97] 2 K. 13:4; Jer. 11:11; 14:12; 29:12; Ps. 69:34(33); Dnl. 9:17; Neh. 1:6, Yahweh's (favorable) hearing of a person or a person's prayer is constructed with *šāma' 'el.* The various texts differ widely in literary context and date. This expression does not, however, appear to be the normal way of expressing a favorable hearing on the part of God, probably because it has connotations of compliance.

c. *Humans Heed God.* It is therefore natural, conversely, to use this construction when humans are to hear Yahweh.

It occurs frequently in Deutero-Isaiah. "The expression שמע אל (Isa. 46:3,12; 48:12; 49:1; 51:1,7; 55:2) is always followed by a reference to the speaker's action or nature, so that שמעו אלי virtually means 'agree with me, believe me,' or the like."[98]

d. *šāma' 'el yhwh* vs. *šāma' bᵉqôl yhwh.* The appearance of *šāma' 'el yhwh* in the book of Ezekiel is interesting (Ezk. 3:7; 20:8,39), since the otherwise common formula for hearing (= heeding) Yahweh, *šāma' bᵉqôl yhwh,* does not appear there.[99] For Ezekiel, such expressions as "the voice *(qôl)* of God" apparently conveyed overtones that ruled out their use. Peculiarities in the use (and avoidance) of the expression *šāma' bᵉqôl yhwh* are probably dependent on the semantics of *qôl.*

In the case of Ezk. 1:28 *(wā'ešma' qôl mᵉḏabbēr),* we may cite Zimmerli: "That Yahweh's name is not mentioned in this, although 'the voice of someone speaking' is

93. See V below.
94. P. 154.
95. Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 150.
96. Ibid., 156-57.
97. See above.
98. Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 142.
99. See the summary in Fenz, 38-39.

referred to cautiously, helps to preserve the mystery of the deity, hidden in the manifestation of his glory."[100] The identity of Yahweh's voice is clearer in 9:1. Ezk. 10:5, which speaks of the voice of Shaddai, must be considered secondary;[101] the same expression in 1:24 is a gloss from 10:5.[102] The *qôl* of Yahweh in the sense of "sound" is also a concomitant of Yahweh's theophany (43:2; cf. 1:24; 3:12). In the book of Ezekiel the "voice of Yahweh" appears to be imbued with such dignity that it does not appear often in the common cliché *šāmaʿ bᵉqôl yhwh.*

On the other hand, the book of Ezekiel frequently mentions the word *(dāḇār)* of Yahweh, in conjunction with *šāmaʿ* in 3:17; 6:3; 13:2; 16:35; 21:3(20:47); 25:3; 34:7,9; 36:1,4; 37:4.

P similarly eschews the expression *šāmaʿ bᵉqôl yhwh.*[103] "The voice of God" is not mentioned in P^G; Nu. 7:89 *(wayyišmaʿ 'eṯ-haqqôl middabbēr 'ēlāyw)* is secondary.[104] This restraint fits with the tendency of P to avoid anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms.[105] True, verbs of sensory perception are used with God — "how can such expressions, colorless to boot, be avoided if one is to speak of God and ascribe to him an active role in the world and its history?"[106] — but an explicit emphasis on this feature, as by referring to God's *qôl,* appears to be avoided.

The terminological peculiarities of Ezekiel and P^G may explain why certain passages in the book of Jeremiah used the expression *šāmaʿ 'el* for heeding Yahweh (7:26; 16:12; 17:24,27; 25:7; 26:4; 34:14,17; 35:14-16), while many others used *šāmaʿ bᵉqôl yhwh.*[107] This usage can reflect a different understanding of the expression *qôl yhwh,* which is reserved for the "voice of revelation" and is therefore avoided in these passages. The expression *qôl yhwh* exhibits remarkable variety in the book of Jeremiah: it is used as an expression of the prophetic message;[108] it parallels *tôrâ* (9:12[13]; 32:23; 44:23;[109] finally, it is suggestive of a theophany (10:13; 25:30; 51:16).

Arambarri offers an original solution to the problem: "The construction שמע בקול is associated closely with original texts in the book of Jeremiah. Even when the construction is clearly redactional, it appears in texts where the original words are vividly effective. . . . The situation differs in the case of שמע אלי. This construction appears in texts that are completely or almost completely the products of redaction."[110] Thiel,[111] on whom Arambarri otherwise relies, considers Jer. 32:23 *(šāmaʿ bᵉqôl)* and its context

100. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 131.
101. Ibid., 232-33, 254.
102. Ibid., 8.
103. Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 131.
104. Noth, *Numbers,* 65.
105. H. Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch* (1896).
106. Ibid., 380.
107. See below.
108. See II.3.b below.
109. See VI.1 below.
110. P. 332.
111. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 32.

Dtr, without any older nucleus.[112] According to Thiel, Jer. 44:23 also belongs to a redactional Dtr section.[113]

e. *bat̲ qôl.* Nu. 7:89 and Ezk. 1:28 — along with Dt. 4:12,33; 5:23-31; 18:16; 1 K. 19:12-13; Isa. 40:3,6; Job 4:12-16; Dnl. 4:28-29(31-32); 8:16 — are among the biblical precursors of the early Jewish idea of the *bat̲ qôl.*[114]

Kuhn characterizes the *bat̲ qôl* as follows: "The phenomenon of a revelatory voice without a visible speaker is particularly consonant with Judaism, a religion of verbal revelation that issues from an invisible God. The beginnings of this phenomenon are already present in scripture."[115] But the problem still remains of accounting for this striking feature, which appears, e.g., in Ezk. 1:28. "The simplest explanation may be that the voice was *experienced* as it is described: not associated immediately with God as speaker. In comparison with Isa. 6, God has grown more alien and more remote in Ezekiel; the appropriate reaction is an aversion to lessening this remoteness in the narrative and in the audition itself, in which it is only the message spoken by the revelatory voice that shows that it is the voice of God."[116] "Not least, with this remoteness of God from the world, Ezekiel lays the groundwork for apocalyptic. Was the remoteness of God possibly characterized ultimately by the loss of the earthly temple as the dwelling place of the deity, a loss that so affected Ezekiel the priest and much of apocalyptic?"[117]

The revelatory voice is not limited to OT texts that speak of a *qôl.* For example, in Ps. 81:6(5) we read: "I hear an unfamiliar voice *(śāp̄â).*"[118] Following the hymn in vv. 2-6a(1-5a), v. 6b introduces the discourse of God that follows; the "I" of the verse is the speaker of God's word.[119] Here *śāp̄â* stands elliptically for the voice (of God) (cf. Ps. 17:4; Job 23:12). The LXX version of Isa. 5:9 may also belong in this context.

The development leading to the *bat̲ qôl* is prefigured within the Dtr tradition in Dt. 5:22-31[120] and the other passages cited above, except that here the expression *šāmaʿ ʾet̲ qôl yhwh* probably has in mind auditory perception (in contrast to the formulation with *b*e[121]).

Within the tradition of Judaism, the concept of the *bat̲ qôl* reduced the importance of prophecy.[122] This change is clearly stated in the Tosefta:[123] "From the time when the

112. For a more differentiated analysis see C. Levin, *Der Verheissung des Neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 172.

113. Pp. 74-75.

114. Kuhn, 6-8, 27-45.

115. P. 343.

116. Kuhn, 13-14.

117. Ibid., 14 n. 23.

118. F. Hitzig, *Psalmen,* II (²1865), 185-86; for textual criticism see C. A. and E. A. Briggs, *Psalms. ICC,* 2 vols. (1906-7), II, 211-12.

119. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2⁵, 356-57.

120. For an analysis see F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 226-40.

121. See II.3.b below.

122. R. Meyer, *TDNT,* VI, 812-28.

123. Tos. *Soṭa* 13:2.

last prophets — Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi — died, the holy spirit vanished from Israel; but it continued to be heard through the *bt qwl*."[124] That the use of the expression *šāma' beqôl yhwh* is controlled by the understanding of the *qôl yhwh* is clear in Isa. 1–39. The (audible) voice of Yahweh appears in 6:8 and 30:30-31. Here *qôl* is not synonymous with "law." Therefore we do not find *šāma' beqôl yhwh* in this part of the book of Isaiah; instead we find *dibrê-sēper* and *tôrat yhwh* as the objects of *šāma'* (29:18; 30:9).

f. *Heeding Prophets.* The prophet who is to be heard as mediator of the divine will represents a special case,[125] as in Dt. 18:15: *'ēlāyw tišmā'ûn,* "him [the prophet] you shall heed." To this ordinance, belonging to the earlier stratum of Deuteronomy,[126] the Dtr supplement in v. 19 adds a commination: "Anyone who does not heed my words . . . I will hold accountable."

This commination furnishes the basis for the theology of the Dtr school (and their successors) in the book of Jeremiah, in which the punishment of the exile is ascribed to the people's refusal to hear and heed Yahweh. The allusion to Dt. 18:19 is quite clear in Jer. 29:19: "Because they did not heed my words, says Yahweh, when I persistently sent to you my servants the prophets, but they would not listen, says Yahweh" (cf. 35:13). The passage in vv. 16-20 is an interpolation into Jeremiah's letter to the exiles. "In a purported address to the remnant left behind in 597, the audience of the exilic period is addressed."[127]

Jer. 11:10; 13:10; 19:15; 25:8 also draw on Dt. 18:19, but these texts use *'et* rather than *'el.* Again we see that the two constructions are interchangeable.

The term *dābār* is to be understood as used by Dtr theology. In it the distinction between the prophetic word and the proclamation of the law is erased. As in the Dtr law governing prophecy, the term covers both.[128]

3. *With be.* a. *General.* Far and away the commonest use of *šāma'* with the prep. *be* is in the expression *šāma' beqôl,* "heed someone's voice" (Gen. 21:12; 27:8,13,43; Ex. 4:1; 18:19; 23:21-22; Dt. 21:18,20; Josh. 22:2; Jgs. 2:2; 20:13; 1 S. 8:7,9,19,22; 12:1; 15:24; 19:6; 25:35; 28:21-22; 2 S. 12:18; 13:14; Isa. 50:10; Jer. 35:8; Prov. 5:13). This expression, which occurs 97 times, Arambarri describes as: "the proper conduct of Israel toward God (65 occurrences, the majority), of children toward their parents, of a disciple toward the (wisdom) instructor, of people of equal status toward each other (brother and sister, husband and wife), of God toward human beings or Israel, of a superior toward subordinates."[129]

---

124. Kuhn, 304.

125. See II.3.b below.

126. U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde. BBB* 65 (1987), 78-88.

127. Thiel, *Jeremia 26–45,* 18.

128. Rüterswörden, *Politischen Gemeinschaft,* 86; → III, 117-18; K. Koch, "Das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," in J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt, eds., *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 125-26.

129. P. 33.

b. *Heeding Yahweh.* The threat of punishment for prophesying in the name of foreign gods in Dt. 13:2-6(1-5) makes a clear terminological distinction: "heed the prophet" is formulated with *šāma' 'el,* "heed Yahweh" with *šāma' b^eqôl yhwh.*[130] This distinction is characteristic of Deuteronomy throughout: *šāma' b^eqôl yhwh* occurs in 4:30; 8:20; 9:23; 13:19(18); 15:5; 26:14,17; 27:10; 28:1-2,15,45,62; 32:2,8,10,20; *šāma' 'el* refers to heeding Yahweh's commandments in 4:1; 11:13,27-28; 28:13,[131] heeding persons in authority, such as the priest in 17:12 and the prophet in 18:15, but also heeding mantics in 18:14. The expression "heed Yahweh's voice" functions for the most part as a cipher for obeying his commandments;[132] it is found primarily "in the conditional clauses of blessing and curse formularies and related texts."[133]

A similar formula is found in the Sefire inscriptions:[134] "And (if) Matiel does not heed [. . .] and all the kings who shall reign in Arpad [. . .] to heaven, then you have broken your oath to all the gods of the treaty named in this inscription."[135]

This distinction is also found in the Dtr portions of the book of Jeremiah: *šāma' 'el* is used for heeding the prophets, both genuine and false (Jer. 7:27; 27:9,14,16-17; cf. 29:8,19; 44:16), while *šāma' b^eqôl yhwh* appears in the mostly Dtr[136] passages 3:13,25; 7:23,28; 9:12(13); 11:4,7; 18:10; 22:21; 26:13; 32:23; 38:20; 40:3; 42:6,13,21; 43:4,7; 44:23.[137] The same expression appears also in exhortations to obey Yahweh (e.g., 7:23; 26:13; 38:20). In the book of Jeremiah hearing, heeding, and obeying may refer to a particular command or to the commandments as a body; *qôl* covers both cases.[138]

The passages in the Pentateuch (apart from Deuteronomy) where we find *šāma' b^eqôl yhwh* give the impression of being late (Dtr at the earliest): Gen. 22:18 and 26:5 belong to the final redaction of the Pentateuch.[139] Ex. 5:2 is a special case. Schmidt assigns this passage to J.[140] Here, however, *qôl* is not synonymous with God's commandments, but stands for a single directive (cf. Gen. 27:8,13).

It remains controversial whether there are pre-Dtr examples of the expression *šāma' b^eqôl yhwh.* Thiel assumes as much for Ex. 5:2; 1 S. 15:19,20,22; 28:18; 1 K. 20:36; Jer. 3:25; 22:21; 38:20.[141] It is characteristic of most of these texts that *qôl* refers to a single directive given by Yahweh and not to the law as a whole. This usage, however, is

130. R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomistische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 63-66, 81.

131. G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971), 260-61.

132. → XII, 587-88; Levin, *Verheissung,* 108 n. 136.

133. N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. AnBibl* 20 (1963), 65.

134. *KAI* 222B.21-23; cf. 223B.2,2′,3,4.

135. O. Rössler, *TUAT,* I, 183.

136. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–24. WMANT* 41 (1973), 86-87.

137. On the use of *šāma' 'el* in the book of Jeremiah, see above.

138. → XII, 587-88.

139. P. Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch. BZAW* 146 (1977), 49-50 n. 145, 84; A. Dillmann, *Genesis. KEHAT* 11 (⁶1892), 291, 323; on Ex. 19:5 see L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 167-81; on Nu. 14:22 see Noth, *Numbers,* 108-9.

140. Schmidt, *Exodus I,* 247-50.

141. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–24,* 86.

also found in Dt. 9:23. Veijola assigns the texts cited by Thiel to the period of the Deuteronomists.[142] The presence of Dtr influence in 1 S. 15 is unclear.[143] The expression occurs also in Josh. 5:6; 24:24; Jgs. 6:10; 1 S. 12:14-15; 2 K. 18:12; Zeph. 3:2; Hag. 1:12; Zec. 6:15; Ps. 95:7; 103:20; 106:25; Dnl. 9:10-11,14.

c. *Yahweh Heeds.* We also find the expression *šāma' bᵉqôl* when Yahweh heeds (or is asked to heed) human beings (Gen. 30:6; Nu. 21:3; Dt. 1:45; Josh. 10:14; Jgs. 13:9; 1 K. 17:22; Ps. 130:2). The nuance resides in the intensity of the prayer to be heard or the special nature of God's intervention as a result of hearing.[144]

4. *With lᵉ.* a. *General.* The construction of *šāma'* with *lᵉ* can hardly be distinguished in meaning from its use with other prepositions.[145] As to *šāma' lᵉqôl:* "In its basic meaning, the notion of assent stands in the foreground; this assent may be occasioned by persuasion, enticement, recommendation, or (occasionally) necessity. The notion of obedience is not present as a primary element. . . . Desirability rather than necessity is implicit. שמע לקול can also point to a new situation, but without suggesting the radical response and change conveyed by שמע בקול. We are dealing here with acceptance of an offer."[146]

The construction is attested from the time of J (Gen. 3:17) to the language of the Damascus Document (CD 3:7-8; 20:28).

b. *Hearing the qôl of Yahweh.* We find this usage with Yahweh as its object in Lev. 26:14,18,21,27; Hos. 9:17; Ps. 81:9,14(8,13). Neh. 9:29 refers to Yahweh's commandments. It is Yahweh's ordinance *(qôl)* that is followed in Ex. 15:25-26; Jgs. 2:20; 1 S. 15:1; Ps. 81:12(11). Despite Jgs. 2:20 (assigned by Smend to DtrN[147]), this construction does not appear to be characteristic of Dtn/Dtr circles.

Ex. 15:26 presents a problem. Wellhausen analyzed the text thus: "In 15:22-27, too, the Jehovist (Deuteronomist?) appears freely to have added v. 26; the verse expands on the obscure final clause of v. 25."[148] There has been a visible shift toward assigning the verse to the Deuteronomists;[149] the careful analysis of the language of vv. 25b and 26 by Lohfink led him to suggest a post-Dtr interpolation.[150] Textual problems complicate the assignment of the verse: a fragment from the Cairo Genizah contains the standard

---

142. T. Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historographie. AnAcScFen* B 198 (1977), 88-89.

143. H. J. Stoebe, *Erste Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 279.

144. Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 40-46.

145. Ibid., 170-71.

146. Ibid., 121.

147. R. Smend, "The Law and the Nations," in G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville, eds., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah. SBTS* 8 (Eng. tr. 2000), 105-7.

148. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des AT* (Berlin, ⁴1963), 79.

149. H. Holzinger, *Exodus. KHC,* II (1900), 53; W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus, Sinai und Mose. EdF* 191 (1983), 96.

150. N. Lohfink, "I Am Yahweh, Your Physician," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1994), 56-63.

Dtr formulation with *bᵉqôl,* as do a number of SP mss. (not cited in *BHS*); in one (w), *b* has been corrected to *l*. There is a masoretic list that supports the text as it stands,[151] but there is no corresponding reference in the marginal masorah of Codex Petropolitanus (Leningradensis) on Ex. 15 (the note in *BHS* is a late addition by G. E. Weil).

According to Ex. 4:8, a sign will legitimize Moses' call; recognition of the sign is described by the expression *šāmaʿ lᵉqôl hāʾōṯ* — surprising language, since the sign is only visible, not audible. To resolve this problem, some have suggested that *qôl* has the sense of "witness"[152] or is used "idiomatically."[153]

III. Figurative Usage. Figurative usage is present when the subject of *šāmaʿ* is neither God nor a human person. For example, the ear as a sensory organ is said to hear (Prov. 15:31; 20:12; 25:12; Job 13:1; 29:11; Eccl. 1:8); in Isa. 6:10 the people listen with *(bᵉ)* their ears.

In 1 K. 3:9 Solomon prays that Yahweh will give him a "hearing heart" *(lēḇ šōmēaʿ)* (NRSV "understanding mind").[154] This expression has long been viewed against the background of Egyptian notions.[155] Görg, however, points out a difference: "This difference manifests itself in the objective of שמע. The Egyptian element of *sḏm* can be conveyed with the aid of categories that, although they have a religious aspect, are primarily concerned with individual ethics. The prayer for a לב שמע, however, reveals a sense of responsibility for the people of Yahweh. The king does not desire to be a 'hearer' for the sake of his own justification; in his role as judge (שפט), he undertakes before God an obligation that involves not just himself but the people. Although the Ptah-hotep text exhibits a precocious stage of reflection, the literature of the Middle Kingdom, New Kingdom, and the later period maintains an interpretation of the function of *b* that is primarily introverted and subjective. This remains true even when the almost radical dependence of *b* on God is acknowledged."[156] The social aspect of "hearing"[157] is all the stronger if we follow the more recent scholars on the books of Kings in interpreting *špṭ* as "govern."

Animals are also said to hear (Ps. 58:6[5]; Job 39:7).

Figurative usage is present when inanimate objects are said to hear. Some of these texts draw on forensic usage (Josh. 24:27; Isa. 1:2; Mic. 6:1-2).[158] After Joshua has bound the people to a covenant obligation (Josh. 24:25),[159] the act is attested by a stone, "because it has heard all the words of Yahweh that he spoke to us" *(kî-hîʾ šāmᵉʿâ*

151. Ibid., 97 n. 68.

152. C. J. Labuschagne, *TLOT,* III, 1134; Schmidt, *Exodus I,* 185-86.

153. → XII, 579.

154. → VII, 422.

155. See I above.

156. P. 87.

157. S. Herrmann, "The Royal Novella in Egypt and Israel," in G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville, eds., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah. SBTS* 8 (2000), 502-5.

158. Delcor, 19-25.

159. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT,* 239-84.

ʾeṯ kol-ʾimrê yhwh, v. 27). Masseboth are known to have served such functions.[160] The Sefire stelae show that such monuments could also bear the text of a treaty.

Mic. 6:2 is Dtr; the preceding v. 1 is a later redactional bridge.[161] The appeal, "Hear, O mountains, Yahweh's lawsuit, give ear, foundations of the earth! For Yahweh holds a lawsuit with his people, he contends with Israel,"[162] uses a metaphor from the legal domain. "That the party in Yahweh's lawsuit is called 'my people' already at the outset suggests that the proceedings are not to be a dispute between enemies but a disagreement among allies."[163] This relationship is clear from the apostrophe to the mountains: they serve as guarantors of international treaties.

For example, l. 30 in the Egyptian version of the treaty between Ramses II and Hattushili III lists among the deities witnessing the oath "[the] mountains (and) rivers of the land of Cheta . . . [the mountains (and) and rivers] of the land of Kizzuwatna . . . the mountains (and) rivers of the land of Egypt, heaven, earth, the great sea, the wind, (and) the storm clouds."[164] The Sefire treaty (8th century) is recorded "in the presence of heave[n and earth and the sea] depths and the springs and day and night: the witnesses are all the g[ods of KTK and the gods of Arpad]."[165] The admonition to regard the text is couched as an appeal not to hear but to look: "Open your eyes to see the terms" (l. 13).

A Hittite treaty in Akkadian calls on gods to bear witness to the agreement, using the vb. *šemû:* "May they come forward, may they hear *(li-el-te-mu-u)* and (be) witnesses . . . mountains and rivers, the go[ds of heaven and the gods] of earth, may they come forward on behalf of the words of this treaty, may they hear *(li-el-te-mu-u)* and may they (be) witness."[166] Even outside of treaties there appears to have been a widespread notion that the earth (along with the stars) can hear.[167]

Heaven and earth are addressed in Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28; in 32:1 they are called on to hear. The language of Isa. 1:2 is similar.[168] An appeal to the earth to hear is also found in the prediction of punishment in Jer. 6:19 (cf. 22:29).

Inanimate objects are called on to hear in a different way in Jer. 20:16 (day), Ezk. 6:3 (mountains of Israel), 21:3 (forest), 36:1,4 (mountains of Israel), 37:4 (bones). Here they are the recipients of prophecy.

IV. Juridical Usage. The vb. *šāmaʿ* and its derivatives also appear in juridical contexts, where bearing witness or the conduct of judicial proceedings may be involved.

---

160. → VIII, 490.

161. H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 169-72; I. Willi-Plein, *Verformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des AT. BZAW* 123 (1971), 97-100.

162. After Wolff, *Micah,* 164.

163. Ibid., 174.

164. E. Edel, *TUAT,* I, 151.

165. *KAI* 222A.11-13.

166. Vo. 39, 58-59: E. F. Weidner, *Boghazköi-Studien* 8 (Leipzig, 1923), 29, 33; see also Delcor, passim.

167. Korpel, 560-61, citing the Ugaritic text *KTU* 1.3, III, 21-26.

168. D. R. Daniels, *ZAW* 99 (1987) 354-60.

According to Barth,[169] there is a single instance of the meaning "testimony"[170] for *šēmaʿ:* "It occurs only once, in Ex. 23:1, in the combination *lōʾ tiśśāʾ šēmaʿ šāwʾ* (in parallel with *ʿēḏ ḥāmās*). Although the root is *šmʿ,* 'hear,' it is worth noting that Hebrew has here developed the same singular meaning often exhibited by Eth. *sĕmĕʿ,* 'testimony.'" Against a similar etymological background, Driver interpreted the *ʾîš šômēaʿ* as "witness."[171] The contexts, however, admit other interpretations, and so these proposals remain uncertain.

Much clearer, however, is the appeal to Yahweh as an earwitness *(šōmēaʿ)* in Jgs. 11:10.[172] The purpose is to reinforce an agreement, thus establishing the juridical setting from which the figurative usage already described[173] derives.

The ostracon from Yavneh-yam represents an administrative appeal.[174] The beginning of the document *(yšmʿ ʾdny hśr ʾt dbr ʿbdh)* reflects the normative usage of *šāmaʿ* in communications addressed to someone of higher status.[175] It is uncertain whether the plea for a hearing marks the beginning of formal judicial proceedings, in which the official addressed *(śr)* would function as judge.[176] Whether the site where the ostracon was discovered (a small fort) requires a judicial role on the part of the officer stationed there remains uncertain, especially since the text itself does not make clear that the functionary addressed must have been an officer.[177] It is an open question whether the official duties of the *śrym* required them to function as judges.[178] Therefore it is uncertain whether the communication is intended to initiate judicial proceedings or — in the form of a petition — seeks the restoration of the status quo ante.

The vb. *šāmaʿ* has a technical sense in juridical settings. In Dt. 1:16-18 the lay judges "hear" during judicial proceedings. The context indicates that this "hearing" is an element of a trial involving two human parties, preceding the action of *špṭ* ("that restores the disturbed order of a [legal] community"[179]).

The precise details of the "hearing" are unclear. Dt. 1:16-18 sounds like an echo of the Roman maxim *audiatur et altera pars,* "let the other sides also be heard." But the question of what the object of *šāmaʿ* can be in a trial leads to a different nuance: the

---

169. J. Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen und aramäischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1902), 49.

170. See also III above.

171. G. R. Driver, *ZAW* 50 (1932) 144-45.

172. G. F. Moore, *Judges. ICC* (^{2}1898), 288; R. G. Boling, *Judges. AB* (1975), 198.

173. See III above.

174. *KAI* 200.

175. See II.1.a above.

176. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébräiques. LAPO* 9 (1977), 261-68, citing Ex. 18:13-26 as background; but the military officers in Ex. 18 are probably secondary (cf. M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist. ATANT* 67 [1981], 247).

177. V. Sasson, *BASOR* 232 (1978) 60-61; D. Pardee, *BASOR* 239 (1980) 47-48; critically reviewed by M. Weippert, *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 459-60 n. 25.

178. U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985), 112-13.

179. G. Liedke, *TLOT,* III, 1393.

point seems to be the admission of a complaint or grievance. Thus Yahweh hears the *ṣᵉʿāqâ* of widows and orphans and those of low social status (Ex. 22:23[24]; cf. v. 26[27]). "Yahweh hears the cry of the socially powerless and provides a legal remedy, playing a role that the ancient Near East generally assigns to the king."[180] The notion that Yahweh hearkens to the cry of the afflicted[181] appears also in Ps. 9:13(12) and Job 34:28. That *ṣᵉʿāqâ* is not an inarticulate scream but a clearly formulated accusation or grievance is shown by Neh. 5:1-13. The hearing is followed by Nehemiah's reform program. Sir. 32(35):16 speaks of hearing the prayer *(tḥnwn)* of one who is wronged.[182]

The procedure is described differently in Dt. 13:13-19(12-18) and 17:2-7, where the issue is apostasy from Yahweh. Here *šāmaʿ* refers to public knowledge of the crime; the inquiry is denoted by *drš*. No *špṭ* action is mentioned in this case: punishment follows directly upon determination that the offense has occurred.

In 2 S. 15:3 the concern is a hearing at court, whether in the administrative or judicial sense. Absalom insinuates that an injustice is done when there is no one at court to hear *(šāmaʿ)* a person's claim, which Absalom describes as being good and right. He imputes a procedure forbidden by Dt. 1:17. The view that a hearing leads to a favorable outcome in legal proceedings lies behind Rachel's statement in Gen. 30:6.

V. Imperatives. A call for the public to hear, formulated with *šāmaʿ*, appears as a prophetic form since the time of Amos.[183] The imperative of *šāmaʿ* can stand by itself or take an object stating what is to be heard. In most cases this is an accusative object; in Deutero-Isaiah we also find *ʾēlay*, "listen to me."[184] The imperative followed by *bᵉqôlî* in Jer. 7:23 and 11:4,7 is a special case: the imperative does not introduce a prophetic oracle; instead, Yahweh himself demands that his voice be heard (cf. Nu. 12:6). The imperative appears occasionally along with the messenger formula, e.g., in Jer. 2:4-5; 7:2-3; 22:2-3. The texts using the hiphil imperative do not exhibit a uniform structure.

The texts where the "word (of Yahweh)" is the object are a matter of controversy. Neumann[185] believes that they are late and considers the construction with *zōʾṯ* as object — as in Am. 8:4 — to be earlier.[186] For the book of Amos, Fleischer takes the opposite position.[187] Among the arguments for denying Amos's authorship of 8:4-7,

---

180. Otto, *Wandel*, 40; see II.1.b above. Cf. Sir. 4:6.

181. H. J. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the OT and Ancient East* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1980), 49-52: "hue and cry, cry for help, outcry"; but see G. F. Hasel, → IV, 120-21.

182. On a "hearing" as an element of judicial proceedings in Egypt, see J. Assmann, *Ma'at* (Munich, 1990), 73-74; also L. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium I. BK* V/1 (1990), 74-75.

183. → III, 110-11; see also C. Hardmeier, *Texttheorie und biblischen Exegese. BEvT* 79 (1978), 302-16; identification of those addressed: 311-16.

184. See II.2.c above.

185. P. 278.

186. Pp. 204-12.

187. G. Fleischer, *Von Menschenverkäufern, Baschankühen und Rechtsverkehrern. BBB* 74 (1989), 183.

he notes that the expression *šimʿû-zōʾṯ* does not appear elsewhere in the book of Amos.[188]

In some of the prophetic books, clauses using the imperative of *šmʿ* are structurally significant; Neumann has demonstrated this for the books of Amos[189] and Jeremiah,[190] as has Hagstrom[191] for the book of Micah. This organization of the material originated with the compositors of the prophetic books.

The fiction that has the author of a written document appeal to be heard is nothing unusual. For example, one of the Amarna letters contains the statement: "I have heard *(iš-te-me)* the words of my lord the king, which he wrote *(ša iš-pu-ur)* to his servant."[192] Such language may reflect the practice of reading aloud.

Neumann finds the origin of this form of prophetic speech in the practice of conveying messages, as described in the OT in 2 K. 18:28-29. "The commander-in-chief Rabshakeh conveys a message from the great king of Assyria to the people of Jerusalem: '. . . Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria! Thus says the king. . . .' The surprising thing about this passage is that vv. 28bβ and 29aα employ the very same combination of formulas used by the prophets and the compositors of the prophetic books since the time of Jeremiah: a *šmʿ* imperative clause followed by the *kh ʾmr yhwh* formula. Prophetic usage differs from that cited only in specifying the *divine* author of the message."[193]

Such an origin may explain why the prophetic appeals to hear are normally not constructed with a prepositional object, even though they clearly aim to influence behavior. The construction of *šāmaʿ* with the accusative normally denotes simple auditory hearing. Its use in the prophetic context, often with *dāḇār*, would constitute another exception. The demand for attention when a secular message is to be conveyed asks to be heard simply in a purely auditory sense, since the content can just as well be information as exhortation.

VI. The Law of Yahweh. Just as the prophetic appeals to be heard are followed by specific oracles of Yahweh, so there is a normative construction calling on Israel to heed Yahweh's *miṣwôṯ* and *tôrâ.* Our analysis will include not only the expression "heed Yahweh's commandments" but also the related terminological field.

1. *tôrâ.* Gen. 26:5 explicates Abraham's hearing of Yahweh's voice by stating that he kept *(šmr)* the law, represented by the four terms *mišmereṯ, miṣwôṯ, ḥuqqôṯ,* and *tôrôṯ* — found together only here. The passage is post-Dtr.[194] Here heeding Yahweh's voice means heeding his law (cf. Jer. 9:12[13]; 26:4; 32:23; 44:23; Dnl. 9:10).

188. But cf. Neumann, 207-12.

189. Pp. 250-54.

190. Pp. 397-99, 407-8.

191. D. G. Hagstrom, *The Coherence of the Book of Micah. SBLDS* 89 (1988).

192. EA 294:6-8.

193. Neumann, 509.

194. See II.3.b above.

The negative *lōʾ šāmᵉʿû* is used absolutely in 2 K. 17:14; the substance of what should have been heard precedes in v. 13: the message of the prophets, namely, exhortation to keep the commandments. The formulation of 2 K. 21:8-9 is similar.

Parallel to heeding the word of Yahweh, Isa. 1:10 speaks of listening to (*ʾzn* hiphil) God's *tôrâ* (cf. Zec. 7:12). The expression "heed the *tôrâ*" appears in Isa. 30:9; 42:24; Prov. 28:9.[195] In Prov. 1:8 and 4:1-2, however, the meaning is "instruction."

2. *miṣwâ.* Another term denoting the law that must be heeded is *miṣwâ.*[196] In Ex. 15:26 heeding Yahweh's voice parallels listening to (*ʾzn* hiphil) his commandments (cf. Lev. 26:14; 1 K. 11:38).

The construction "heed Yahweh's *miṣwôṯ*" appears in Jgs. 2:17 and Neh. 9:16,29. "Heed someone's *miṣwâ*" (Jer. 35:14,18) may be an everyday expression.

VII. Deuteronomy. In the prophetic books the transition from hearing the particular prophetic word of God to heeding the commandments is mediated by views found in Deuteronomy. The starting point is Dt. 6:4, the verse with which — scholars commonly believe — the earlier form of Deuteronomy began. Together with v. 5, it represents a form whose features have been identified by Halbe:

Ia Interjection	*šmʿ yśrʾl*
Ib Declaration	*yhwh ʾlhynw yhwh ʾḥd*
II Exhortation	*wʾhbt ʾt yhwh ʾlhyk*[197]

"We have here a fixed syntactic schema that . . . appears so commonly in the OT as well as in the languages of the ancient Near East that it strikes us at first simply as a basic mode of expression available whenever someone addresses a command (a suggestion, a request) to someone else. In the first element, the speaker names the presupposition behind the action or behavior that he requires of the addressee in the second element — be this presupposition the material object affected by the action; the circumstance that suggests, enables, or requires the action; or the speaker's own behavior to which the action corresponds."[198]

It is noteworthy that Dt. 6:4, unlike other examples of this form, begins not with "see" but with "hear." According to Halbe, this observation reflects the Dtn understanding of law. "And truly (Dt. 5, in its highly fundamental hermeneutical function, reflects the reasons): there is nothing to 'see,' not in the 'today' of Moses' words. What determines this 'today,' indeed what allows this 'today' to come into being: independently of the passage of time — is the presence of Yahweh in the word, in the word of his 'Moses'! A presence that interrupts the world — therefore in words; a presence that

195. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 623.

196. → VIII, 509-11; Koch, "Profetenschweigen," in *FS Wolff,* 125-26.

197. P. 57.

198. Halbe, *Privilegrecht Jahwes,* 98-99; examples: 98-107; see originally N. Lohfink, *Bibl* 41 (1960) 124-25.

interrupts time — therefore 'today': summoning each from his constraints — to 'homological existence' (G. Ebeling): to live and to act *'ex auditu';* conformably to the word; conformably to Yahweh, so that nothing is left out: 'with all your heart and all your soul and all your might' (6:5)."[199]

This "hearing" is what distinguishes the Dtn foundations of the law from others. "Clothing the Dtn law in the form of a discourse spoken by Moses forestalls as though by design the metaphor of legitimation that association with the kingship would offer: an origin in the mythic primal age of creation. What matters is not the law's antiquity! But such antiquity is at least suggested when this law is compared with the law codes of related civilizations. For holiness and antiquity symbolize what undergirds them: the notion that there is no conceivable alternative to a legal order, that it is not contingent, that — in the mythology of creation — its force undergirds the world. There is none of that here: not 'in those days' but 'today'; not 'from time immemorial' but 'hearing' right now; not a creating word in the beginning, but Yahweh in the word now present — these are what support the law's claims, and enable its fulfillment."[200]

The understanding of the law that finds expression in Dt. 6:4-5 is well described by Perlitt: "The law has its basis, but also its rationale, in the fact that 'our God' has opened the door to life. For this very reason, the great commandment of Dt. 6:5 logically follows 6:4: just as Yahweh is all in all for Israel, so Israel's love must belong entirely to him. Love given and returned — that is the Dtn hermeneutic of the law. The juxtaposition of Dt. 6:4 and 5 therefore points to what the authors had thought through theologically: the fact that the law cannot be put into practice — and therefore actually 'kills' — without the emotional connection of love given and returned."[201]

The recitation of the Shema *(šᵉmaʿ)* twice a day in Judaism is based on the interpretation of Dt. 6:7.[202] The prominence given the letters **ע** and **ד** in 6:4 is probably intended as an attention-getting device to ensure proper reading of the verse.[203] The significance of the *šᵉmaʿ* is further emphasized by mezuzahs[204] and tefillin.

Appeals to hear are also found in Dt. 4:1; 5:1; 9:1 (cf. 20:3; 27:9).

The expression *šāmaʿ bᵉqôl yhwh* (or *bᵉqôlô*) is common in Deuteronomy.[205] Dt. 4:29-35 and 30:1-10 constitute a frame; embedded within the other framing passages 4:1-4,9-14 + 29:1b-14(2b-15)* and 4:15-16a*,19-28 + 29:15-27(16-28)*, they represent the latest, postexilic composition, which already presupposes the Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah.[206] According to Knapp, it is safe to assume "that for the author of these verses, the expressions שמע בקול יהוה, שוב (אל יהוה), and the correspond-

199. Halbe, "Gemeinschaft," 57-58.

200. Ibid., 62-63.

201. L. Perlitt in T. Veijola, ed., *The Law in the Bible and in Its Environment. PFES* 51 (1990), 28.

202. Mish. *Ber.* 1:1-3; see O. Holtzmann, *Die Mischna I,1: Berakot* (1912), 1-10; L. Jacobs, *EncJud,* XIV, 1370-74.

203. I. Yeivin, *Intro. to the Tiberian Massorah. Masoretic Studies* 5 (1980) 48.

204. → VIII, 226-27.

205. See II.3.b above.

206. D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 161-62.

ing expressions denoting obedience to the law are synonymous. This allows us to conclude that in 4:30, too, returning to Yahweh and heeding his voice refer ultimately to the (Dtn) law and heeding ספר התורה הזה."[207] That heeding Yahweh's voice is substantially the same as keeping the *tôrâ* is shown by 30:10 and 31:12. Frequently *šāma' beqôl yhwh* is further qualified by references to obeying the commandments.[208] The instances are concentrated at the conclusion of Deuteronomy, e.g., in Dt. 28;[209] most of them do not give the impression of pre-Dtr authorship.[210]

As the speaker of Deuteronomy, Moses uses the expression *qôl yhwh;* this is how God communicates. The words of Moses are thus characterized (substantially, not formally) as the words of God. It is therefore clear how the same expression can also be placed in the mouth of the prophets: in the Dtr view they are the incumbents of the Mosaic prophetic office. Therefore they are authorized to speak in the fashion.

In addition to heeding the voice of Yahweh, Deuteronomy also speaks of heeding the various terms referring to the law (e.g., Dt. 4:1; 5:1; 7:12; 11:13,27,28; 12:28; 28:13).[211] In the earlier stage of Deuteronomy, this "hearing" or "heeding" should be seen in the context of its own grounding of the law, which — in contrast to others — proposes an alternative design. Later textual development places more emphasis on hearing Yahweh's commandments. In postexilic texts, this hearing guarantees Israel's new beginning. "If Israel returns, i.e., heeds the law once more, then Yahweh will prove to be merciful."[212] Through its law governing prophets, Deuteronomy influenced the book of Jeremiah: the prophet becomes a warning voice on behalf of the *tôrâ;* to heed Yahweh means to observe his laws (cf. Dt. 28:1,45).

This holds true despite the statements that the people did not heed Yahweh and his prophets (Jer. 3:13,25; 7:13,24,26; 9:12[13]; 11:8; 13:11; 17:23; 18:10; 25:3,4; etc.).[213] These passages embody reflections on the causes of the exile. This notion is even more evident when *šāma'* is conjoined with verbs of volition to express the people's refusal to hear *(lō' 'āḇâ:* Isa. 30:9; Ezk. 3:7; 20:8; *m'n* piel: Jer. 11:10; 13:10; Neh. 9:17). In Isa. 6:10, however, the order to make the people stubborn blames their failure to hear not on their free will but on the will of Yahweh.[214]

VIII. Wisdom. Appeals to hear appear in Ps. 49:2(1); 50:7; Prov. 1:8; 4:1,10; 5:7; 7:24; 8:6,32,33; 19:20; 22:17; 23:19,22; Sir. 16:24; 30:27 (= 33:19); 34(31):22; 51:28; etc. At the beginning of the book of Proverbs (1:8) we find: "Hear, my son, the disci-

---

207. P. 95.

208. See the tabulation in Lohfink, *Hauptgebot,* 299-302.

209. On identification of the different strata see Seitz, 254ff.

210. On 26:17bβ, see Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT,* 102-15.

211. On their different nuances see G. Braulik, *Bibl* 51 (1970) 39-66 = *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 11-38.

212. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4,* 156, speaking of Dt. 30:1-10.

213. O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. WMANT* 23 (1967), 60-80.

214. → VII, 427-28; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. tr. ²1983), 120-21; C. Hardmeier, "Jesajas Verkündigungsabsicht und Jahwes Verstockingsauftrag in Jes 6," in *FS Wolff,* 235-51.

pline *(mûsār)* of your father, and do not reject the instruction *(tôrâ)* of your mother; for they are a fair garland for your head, and pendants for your neck." "This verse is quite in accord with the prologue in 1:1-7, markedly programmatic in nature, which explicitly thematizes 'hearing': 'Let the wise hear *(yšm')* . . .' (v. 5). This hearing is, as it were, the fundamental prerequisite for acquiring wisdom, for by it one learns 'to understand proverb and figure, the words of the wise and their riddles' (v. 6). By the internal logic of the prologue, therefore, it is only consistent that wisdom instruction proper should begin with an exhortation to 'hear' in just this way."[215]

The Teaching of Amenemope begins similarly with an exhortation to hear: "Lend your ears, hear what is said; / give your heart to understand it. / It is useful to put it in your heart, / but woe to whoever despises it. / Let it rest in the casket of your belly, / and it will be a peg in your heart. / Then if a whirlwind of words arises, / it will be a mooring post for your tongue. / If you spend your life with this in your heart, / then you will find that it brings success. / You will find my words a treasury for life, / and your body will be whole upon earth."[216] This kind of material appears also in the book of Proverbs, e.g., in 8:32-36. The goal of sapiential listening is "to be useful to the hearer; it has an effect, it opens the future, ultimately it yields a long, happy, and successful life."[217]

The object of such hearing is often *mûsār,* "discipline, instruction."[218] This expression describes the constitutional capacity to lead a successful life. "Hearing" such discipline means that *šāmaʿ* "must involve, over and above purely auditory perception, the aspect of *obedience.* Not, of course, in the sense of subjection to an alien norm, whether or not it benefits the learner. This obedience presupposes insightful comprehension, discerning openness; it functions as a kind of perpetual internalization process."[219]

Neumann distinguishes the sapiential-didactic use of appeals to hear in the book of Proverbs from the sapiential-discursive usage found in the book of Job, where it serves to call for attention at the beginning of a unit of discourse.[220]

IX. Niphal. In the niphal *šāmaʿ* means "be heard," usually in the sense of acoustic perception. As in the case of the qal, what is heard is often a *qôl* (sound, noise, voice); *qôl* can also function as a neutral expletive:[221] Isa. 65:19; Jer. 9:18(19); 33:10-11; 49:21; Ezk. 10:5; 26:13; Nah. 2:14(13); Cant. 2:12.

In 2 Ch. 30:27 we find the construction *wayyiššāmaʿ bᵉqôlām,* analogous to the usage of the qal. This expression is used to indicate that Yahweh heard (and ratified) the

---

215. Neumann, 116-17.

216. Ll. 47-59; Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit,* 238-39; for a comparison with Prov. 22:17-21 see D. Römheld, *Wege der Weisheit. BZAW* 184 (1989), 18-27.

217. Neumann, 137.

218. → VI, 131-32.

219. Neumann, 140.

220. Pp. 163-64.

221. See II.1.a above.

prayer of blessing spoken by the priests and Levites. Willi finds a similar passive when God is the logical subject in 2 Ch. 26:15 and 28:5b.[222] Some scholars have suggested reading 2 Ch. 30:27 as a qal.[223] In Dnl. 10:12, too, the passive is used to say that Daniel's words have been favorably heard.

A nuance of "pay attention to" is present in Eccl. 9:16-17, and the notion of active response in 2 S. 22:45//Ps. 18:45(44).

X. Hiphil. In the hiphil *šāmaʿ* has such meanings as "cause to hear, cause to resound, make music, proclaim," as well as the specialized military sense "call up, muster."[224]

According to Neumann, the hiphil imperative of *šāmaʿ* in Isa. 48:20; Jer. 4:5,16; 5:20; 31:7; 46:14; 50:2; Am. 3:9 marks the instructions given to a herald (cf. Isa. 52:7).[225]

Deutero-Isaiah frequently uses the hiphil of *ngd*[226] in conjunction with the hiphil of *šāmaʿ* (Isa. 41:22,26; 42:9; 43:9,12; 44:7,8; 45:21; 48:3,5,20). (The combination is not limited to Deutero-Isaiah: it appears also in Jer. 4:15 and 46:14.) In the classification used by Elliger and Hermisson,[227] this expression appears in two rhetorical forms (not always clearly identifiable): forensic discourse (41:21-29; 43:8-13; 44:6-8; 45:20-21) and disputation (42:5-9[?]; 48:1-11). The content of the message can be "new things" (*ḥ^a^d̲āšôt̲,* Isa. 42:9; 48:6) or "former prophecies" (43:9). Adverbial qualifiers like *mēʾāz* (44:8; 48:5) and *miqqed̲em* indicate that ancient prophecies are now being fulfilled.

The action denoted by *šāmaʿ* hiphil can be instigated by Yahweh (Dt. 4:10,36; Jgs. 13:23; 2 K. 7:6; Isa. 30:30; 62:11; Jer. 18:2; 49:2; Ezk. 36:15; Ps. 51:10[8]; 76:9[8]; 143:8; Sir. 45:5) or by a human agent making Yahweh's praise heard (*tôd̲â,* Ps. 26:7; *qôl t^e^hillāt̲ô,* Ps. 66:8; cf. 106:2).

XI. Piel. The two instances of the piel (1 S. 15:4; 23:8) have the specialized military sense of "muster." This meaning is clear from the context (par. to *pqd* in 15:4; with *lammilḥāmâ* in 23:8) and the versions (LXX *parangéllein,* "call [to arms]"; Vg. *praecepti*).[228] Vocalization as a hiphil might be worth considering;[229] in 1 K. 15:22; Jer. 50:29; 51:27, LXX *parangéllein* represents *šāmaʿ* hiphil in the sense of "muster."

XII. Nominal Derivatives. Of the nominal derivatives of *šmʿ, šēmaʿ* and *šemûʿâ* occur with some frequency.

The noun *šēmaʿ,* "hearing, report," appears together with *šāmaʿ* in Gen. 29:13; Nu. 14:15; Dt. 2:25; 1 K. 10:1; Jer. 37:5; 50:43; Nah. 3:19; 2 Ch. 9:1.

---

222. T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. FRLANT* 106 (1972), 125 n. 67.

223. J. W. Rothstein, "Chronik," *HSAT,* II (⁴1923), 665; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher,* 303; *BHS* — but not *BHK.*

224. Arambarri, *Wortstamm,* 303-18.

225. Pp. 443-61.

226. → IX, 181-82.

227. *Deuterojesaja I-II. BK* XI/1-2 (1978, 2003).

228. See the comments by Jenni, *HP,* 220.

229. K. Budde, *Samuel. KHC* VIII (1902), 108; H. P. Smith, *Samuel. ICC* (1899), 134; *BHK.*

This is also true of *šᵉmûʿâ* in 1 S. 4:19; 2 K. 19:7; Isa. 37:7; Jer. 51:46. Ob. 1//Jer. 49:14 speaks of hearing a *šᵉmûʿâ* from Yahweh. As a term for prophetic revelation, the word appears already in Isaiah (Isa. 28:9;[230] cf. 28:19; Ezk. 21:12[7]).

A number of names include the root *šmʿ*. "Hearing is extraordinarily common in the OT in the sense of hearing favorably or granting (a prayer). In the specialized sense of granting the prayer of a childless woman, which we have associated with the use of שמע in personal names, the verb appears in Gen. 16:11 in the explanation of the name Ishmael and in Gen. 29:33 in the explanation of the name Simeon, as well as in Gen. 30:6."[231] Names of this type were widespread throughout the Semitic world.[232]

XIII. LXX. When the LXX translates *šāmaʿ* with the vb. *akoúein* and its compounds, the Greek reader faces the unaccustomed idea that religious content is revealed primarily through speech, not through vision.[233] But visual perception also has its place — sometimes underestimated — in the OT.[234]

When Yahweh hears and grants human prayers, the LXX often uses *eisakoúein.* That the deity hears human prayers is a common mode of expression for the Greek reader.[235] "Hear" can also mean "obey": "His people obeyed *(ákouen)* him as though he were God."[236]

The LXX translates "heed Yahweh's voice" with *akoúein* (or a compound) *tḗs phōnḗs kyríou.* This idiom is good Greek; it denotes auditory perception in such passages as Herodotus 2.70; 4.129; 8.65; Pausanias 7.22; Acts 9:7; 11:7,22; Rev. 11:12; 14:13; 16:1; 21:3.

XIV. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the vb. *šāmaʿ* (qal, niphal, and hiphil) usually denotes auditory perception on the part of both humans and animals (1QM 6:13). The Damascus Document begins with an appeal to hear (CD 1:1). Such appeals are addressed to *kl ywdʿy ṣdq* (1:1), *kl bʾy bryt* (2:2), *bnym* (2:14), *kl ywdʿy ṣdq w*[*ʿwśh*] *twr*[*h*] (4Q270 92:19[237]); cf. the appeal *šmʿw ḥkmym wšḥy dʿt* in 1QH 1:34-35. An appeal *(šmʿh yśrʾl)* modeled on Dt. 20:3 appears in 1QM 10:3. That Yahweh hears someone who calls (*šmʿ* with accusative) is attested in 1QH 5:12. An appeal to God *(šmʿ ʾlhy)* in the context of a prayer is found in 4Q381 31 4.

The hiphil of *šmʿ* is fairly common, especially in the group of texts 4Q400-407 (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice). Here the meaning appears to have expanded some-

---

230. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 244-45.

231. *IPN,* 185; on Ishmael see E. A. Knauf, *Ismael. ADPV* (1985), esp. 1-16, 113.

232. *AN,* 166-67, 189; Benz, 419, 421.

233. G. Kittel, *TDNT,* I, 217-19.

234. → XIII, 216; Kraus, *Aufsätze,* 89-94.

235. Cf. *Iliad* 1.381; 16.531.

236. *Odyssey* 8.11.

237. B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, eds., *Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four,* I (Washington, 1991), 41.

what in the direction of "make known,"[238] as in 4Q401 14 2:7: *hšmyʿw nstrwt,* "they made known hidden matters." An announcement is made in the midst of stillness *(bdmmt)* in 4Q401 16 2 and 402 9 3.[239] One occurrence of the niphal says that the sound of blessing *(qwl hbrk)* is heard (4Q403 2:12). A parallel expression, probably synonymous with *šmʿ* hiphil, is *spr* piel/pual (1QS 1:21-22; 1QH 1:23).

Noteworthy are certain specialized meanings and constructions, e.g., *šmʿ* niphal, "obey" (1QS 5:23; 6:2).[240] In the Dead Sea Scrolls the notion of heeding someone can be expressed by *šmʿ* with a pronominal suffix (1QH 4:24; cf. 18:7); the text suggests an active response. Comparable constructions in the OT are probably late.[241] We also find constructions with *ʾl* (CD 2:2) and *l* (CD 2:14; 4Q270 9 2:19; with *lqwl,* 20:28). The expression *šmʿ bqwl* also appears (4Q499 7 3); the formulation of 4Q504 1-2 5:13 follows Dt. 30:2. The failure of a witness to speak out after hearing *(šmʿ)* the public adjuration to testify concerning a transgression, an offense described in Lev. 5:1 and Prov. 29:24,[242] is also mentioned in CD 9:8-23. A lament declares that the sound of joy *(šmḥh)* is no longer heard (*šmʿ* niphal, 4Q179 1:13); the same topos appears in Ezk. 26:13 (niphal).[243]

The expression *ky hš]mym whʾrṣ yšmʿw lmšyḥw* (4Q521 2 2:1),[244] "for heaven and earth heed his [? pl.] messiah," recalls the figurative usage of *šmʿ*[245] as well as Mark 9:7 and parallels.

Rüterswörden

238. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 138.
239. Ibid., 141.
240. See IX above.
241. See II.1.a above.
242. See II.1.a above.
243. See also *KAI* 222A.19 (ethpaal).
244. E. Puech, *RevQ* 15 (1991/92) 485.
245. See III above.

שָׁמַר *šāmar;* אַשְׁמֹרֶת/אַשְׁמוּרָה *ʾašmûrâ/ʾašmōreṯ;* מִשְׁמָר *mišmār;* שָׁמְרָה *šomrâ;* שְׁמֻרָה *šᵉmurâ;* שִׁמֻּרִים *šimmurîm;* שֶׁמֶר *šemer*

I. Ancient Near East: 1. Akkadian; 2. Ugaritic; 3. Phoenician; 4. Extrabiblical Hebrew; 5. Aramaic. II. Occurrences: 1. Distribution; 2. Parallelisms and Combinations. III. Meaning: 1. Verb; 2. Nominal Derivatives. IV. Qal: 1. Concrete and Secular Usage; 2. Figurative and Religious Usage. V. Niphal. VI. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāmar. R. Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot. EH* XXIII/242 (1991); K. Baltzer, *Covenant Formulary* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1971); G. Bertram, "Theologische

I. Ancient Near East. The root *šmr* is found in most Semitic languages.[1]

1. *Akkadian.* There are two homonymous roots in Akkadian.[2] The meaning of *šamāru(m)* I is "rage, storm."[3] For example, a ritual text against Libartu on a small tablet (Seleucid period) from Warka reads: *ezzet šamrat,* "she [the daughter of Anu] is angry, she is enraged."[4] The meaning of *šamāru(m)* II is "praise (God)."[5] A hymn to Shamash describes his worship in the following terms: *ši-na-ma pal-ḫa-ka* [*i*]*š-tam-ma-ra zi-kir-k*[*a*], "but they are afraid and offer worship to your name."[6] A hymn to Nabu repeats the formula *liš-tam-mar ilu-ut-ka,* "that he may worship your divinity."[7]

Although as a rule the OT uses the vb. *šmr* with the meaning "watch, keep," none of the meanings of Akk. *šamāru(m)* lies totally outside the semantic spectrum of the biblical texts. It has been claimed that both Akkadian verbs are homonymous with Heb. *šmr.*[8] For example, in Jer. 3:5a *šmr* is used as a synonym for *nṭr,* with the meaning "rage": *hᵃyinṭōr lᵉʻôlām ʼim-yišmōr lāneṣaḥ,* "Will he be angry forever, will he rage to the end?" (cf. also Am. 1:11).[9] In the Psalm of Jonah (Jon. 2:9[Eng. 8]), on the other hand, the piel of *šmr* appears with the meaning "worship, praise." The translations of

---

Aussagen im griechischen AT: Gottesnamen," *ZNW* 69 (1978) 239-46, esp. 245; idem, "φυλάσσω," *TDNT,* IX, 236-44; H. Dahan, "Reflexivity," *Leš* 44 (1980) 219-23; W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. FRLANT* 108 (1972); D. A. Diewert, "Job 7:12," *JBL* 106 (1987) 203-15; F. García López, "Analyse littéraire de Deutéronome V–XI," *RB* 84 (1977) 481-522; 85 (1978) 5-49; idem, "Deut. VI et la tradition-rédaction du Deutéronome," *RB* 85 (1978) 161-200; 86 (1979) 59-91; M. Held, "Studies in Biblical Homonyms in the Light of Accadian," *JANES* 3 (1970/71) 47-55; K. Jeppesen, "Micah V 13 in the Light of a Recent Archaeological Discovery," *VT* 34 (1984) 462-66; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 247-87, esp. 278-80; F. Langlamet, "Israël et 'l'habitant du pays,'" *RB* 76 (1969) 321-50, 481-507, esp. 327-29; N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. AnBibl* 20 (1963), esp. 68-70; J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I: The Encroacher and the Levite. UCP Near Eastern Studies* 14 (Berkeley, 1970); N. Negretti, *Il settimo giorno. AnBibl* 55 (1973); J. du Preez, "Oor die identiteit van 'wagte' en 'herinneraars' in Jes 62:6-7," *NGTT* 29 (1988) 390-95; G. Sauer, "שׁמר *šmr* to watch, guard, keep," *TLOT,* III, 1380-84; R. Smend, "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies in Deuteronomistic History. SBTS* 8 (Eng. tr. 2000), 95-110; W. M. Soll, "The Question of Psalm 119:9," *JBL* 106 (1987) 687-88; J. R. Spencer, "The Tasks of the Levites: *šmr* and *ṣbʼ*," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 267-71.

1. *HAL,* 1581-82.
2. *CAD,* XVII/1, 296-98, lists three.
3. *AHw,* III, 1154; *CAD,* XVII/1, 296-97.
4. F. Thureau-Dangin, *RA* 18 (1921) 166 l. 13, 170 l. 13.
5. *AHw,* III, 1154; *CAD,* XVII/1, 297-98.
6. W. von Soden, *SAHG,* 246; cf. *BWL,* 137.
7. W. von Soden, *ZA* 61 (1971) 60 ll. 213,215. For additional texts, mostly religious in content, see C. J. M. Weir, *Lexicon of Accadian Prayers in the Rituals of Expiation* (Oxford, 1934), 323; *AHw,* III, 1154.
8. *HAL,* II, 1581; see also W. von Soden, *UF* 13 (1981) 164, with respect to *šamāru(m)* II.
9. Held, 47-48.

this verse include "the worshipers of vain idols,"[10] "those who worship unfounded Nothingness/worthless idols,"[11] and "those who worship vain idols" (NRSV). Allen cites Akk. *šummrru* to illuminate the meaning of the verse.[12]

2. *Ugaritic.* In Ugaritic the term *šmrm* occurs in the both the absolute and construct.[13] Beside a list of 21 proper names, we find *šmrm pʿṣ bn byy ʿśrt.*[14] The text refers to watchmen or sentries *(šmrm)* sent to *pʿṣ* the son of *byy* that each may receive ten shekels of silver for his work.[15]

The root *šmr* is an element of many proper names,[16] among which "Samaria" stands out. According to 1 K. 16:24, Omri bought the hill of Samaria *(šōmᵉrôn)* from Shemer *(šemer),* fortified it, and then named the city after the former owner of the hill of Samaria. According to Šanda,[17] both the name of the owner and the name of the city *(šmr/šmrwn)* derive from the Arab./OSA root *ṯmr,* "bear fruit, have an abundance of," which cannot be distinguished in Hebrew from *šmr;* the name means roughly "abundant yield."[18] This root also appears in Akkadian, Amorite, and Arabic names.[19]

While Weippert,[20] calling Samaria a "pre-Omride settlement of the *Šēmer* clan," accepts the derivation of *šmrwn* given in 1 K. 16:24, according to Noth,[21] "the figure of שֶׁמֶר . . . is a secondary construction to 'explain' the name שֹׁמְרוֹן." Another proposed etymology connects the toponym with the vb. *šmr,* so that it would mean something like "watchtower."[22]

3. *Phoenician.* When we turn to the Phoenician and Punic languages, we must note above all two inscriptions discovered in the necropolis of Dermesh, near Carthage, in which we read: *nṣr wšmr ḥlṣbʿl bn ʾrštbʿl* and *šmr wnṣr ḥlṣbʿl bn ʾšy,* "*ḥlṣbʿl* son of *ʾrštbʿl/ʾšy* guarded and watched."[23] These have been described as talismans, amulets with magical formulas.[24] Of particular interest in the light of the OT is the use of *šmr* in parallel with *nṣr.*[25]

---

10. W. Rudolph, *Joel — Amos — Obadja — Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 346.

11. H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 126-27.

12. L. C. Allen, *Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah. NICOT* (1976), 215, with n. 6.

13. *UT,* no. 2443; *WUS,* no. 2642.

14. *KTU* 4.170, 24-25.

15. C. Virolleaud, *PRU,* II (1957), 75, no. 47; O. Eissfeldt, *JSS* 5 (1960) 14 = *KlSchr,* II (1963), 385.

16. *HAL,* II, 1585-89.

17. A. Šanda, *Könige. EHAT* IX/1 (1911), 404-5.

18. See M. C. Astour, "Place Names," *RSP,* II, 337-38, no. 113, where Ugaritic toponyms are cited.

19. *APNM,* 81-82, 267.

20. H. Weippert, *BRL*², 265.

21. M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 353; also *HAL,* II, 1587.

22. *BRL*¹, 438; also E. Würthwein, *Könige I: 1.Kön. 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1977), 199; Sauer, 1381; *HAL,* II, 1587.

23. Tomback, 325; cf. *DISO,* 310.

24. *ESE,* I (1902), 171-74.

25. See II.2.a below.

A Punic inscription from Malta,[26] dating between the 4th and 2d centuries B.C.E., uses the active participle of *šmr* as a noun, denoting the office of an inspector or guardian: *šmr mḥṣb,* "quarry inspector."[27] This use of the participle in conjunction with another term to describe an office is very common in Biblical Hebrew.[28]

Finally, it is worth mentioning the series of Phoenician and Punic names containing the element *šmr,* e.g., *šmrbʿl, bʿlšmr, ʾšmnšmr,* and *ʿbdšmr.*[29]

4. *Extrabiblical Hebrew.* In extrabiblical Hebrew *šmr* occurs twice in 9th-century inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud, once as a toponym in the blessing formula *brkt ʾtkm lyhwh šmrn wlʾšrth,*[30] "I bless you by Yahweh [?] of Samaria and by his Asherah," and once as a verb in the wish *ybrk wyšmrk,*[31] "may he bless you and keep you."[32]

We also find *šmr* on two ostraca from Lachish, once in the qal[33] and once in the niphal.[34] In a letter from Lachish (ostracon 4), a subordinate assures his superior that he has acted in accordance with the instructions he has received. These included several signals that served as a communication system among the three major fortresses of the kingdom of Judah (Jerusalem, Lachish, and Azekah) during the time of the Babylonian invasion. Ll. 10-11 must be read against this background: *wydʿ ky ʾl mšʾt lkš nḥnw šmrm kll hʾtt ʾšr ntn,* "and let [my lord] know that we are watching for the signals of Lachish,[35] following all the instructions given by my lord."[36]

Ostracon 3 is even more significant, since it contains the longest Hebrew text so far discovered dating from the period of the Israelite monarchy. It casts vivid light on the political alliance between Judah and Egypt toward the end of the monarchy. L. 20 mentions a prophet — possibly Jeremiah — who opposes the pro-Egyptian policies of the Judahite regime.[37] Besides its association with the book of Jeremiah, the text of this ostracon contains a number of echoes of biblical names and expressions. Particularly important in our context is l. 21: *hšmr šlḥh ʿb[d]k ʾl ʾdny,* "Beware! Your servant has sent [this warning] to my lord."[38] The expression "Beware!" characterizes the message of the prophet Elisha to the king of Israel (2 K. 6:9) and the oracle of the prophet Isaiah to King Ahaz (Isa. 7:4). The ostracon also has to do with the message of a prophet,

---

26. *KAI* 62.7.
27. *KAI,* II, 79.
28. See IV.1-2.
29. Benz, 421.
30. Pithos 1.
31. Pithos 2.
32. Z. Meshel, *BAR* 5 (1979) 24-36; J. A. Emerton, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 1-20; D. Conrad, *TUAT,* II, 561-64; J. M. Hadley, *VT* 37 (1987) 180-213; H.-P. Müller, *ZAH* 5 (1992) 15-51, esp. 26.
33. No. 4, l. 11 = *KAI* 194.11.
34. No. 32, l. 21 = *KAI* 193.21.
35. Cf. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I: Les ostraca. LAPO* 9 (1977), 100: "for it is the signal of Lachish that we are observing."
36. *KAI,* II, 194.
37. D. Winton Thomas, *"The Prophet" in the Lachish Ostraca* (1946); H. Michaud, *JA* 239 (1951) 78; for a different view see W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 105 (1947) 15.
38. *KAI,* II, 192.

whose role as counselor and adviser finds expression in the use of the formula "Beware!"[39]

5. *Aramaic.* In Aramaic the vb. *šmr* occurs only in the story of Ahiqar, in three proverbs.[40] In the first two, it is in the imperative: *pmk 'štmr lk,* "Watch your mouth!"; *'štmr lk,* "Watch out for yourself!"[41] In the reconstruction by Lindenberger,[42] Ahiqar 160 reads: *[hn l' y]štmr 'yš 'm 'lhn wmh ytnṭr 'l,* "[If] someone does [not] enjoy the protection of the gods, how should he protect himself from his inner sin?"[43] Formally, we note the parallelism of the verbs *šmr* and *nṣr,* found also in a whole series of biblical texts.[44] According to Lindenberger, the proverb may be a "confession of human inability to achieve goodness without divine help . . . a rare glimpse into the Aramean ethical consciousness."[45]

II. Occurrences.

1. *Distribution.* The 373 occurrences of *šmr* in the qal are distributed as follows: Tetrateuch 63 (Genesis 12, Exodus 20, Leviticus 16, Numbers 15), Deuteronomy 58, DtrH 66 (Joshua 10, Judges 3, 1 Samuel 12, 2 Samuel 8, 1 Kings 23, 2 Kings 10), Prophets 42 (Isaiah 7, Jeremiah 6, Ezekiel 16, Hosea 3, Amos 2, Micah 1, Zechariah 3, Malachi 4), Psalms 62 (21 in Ps. 119), Wisdom 50 (Job 11, Proverbs 31, Ecclesiastes 8), ChrH 31 (Ezra 1, Nehemiah 9, 1 Chronicles 8, 2 Chronicles 13), Daniel 1.

In addition to these occurrences, in 54 passages the nominalized ptcp. *šômēr* appears: Numbers 4, Deuteronomy 2, Judges 2, 1 Samuel 2, 2 Kings 6, Isaiah 4, Jeremiah 5, Ezekiel 4, Psalms 7, Ecclesiastes 1, Esther 6, Song of Songs 3, Daniel 1, Nehemiah 3, 1 Chronicles 2, 2 Chronicles 2.

The niphal of *šmr* occurs 37 times: Tetrateuch 8 (Genesis 3, Exodus 5), Deuteronomy 13, DtrH 8 (Joshua 1, Judges 2, 1 Samuel 2, 2 Samuel 1, 2 Kings 2), Prophets 6 (Isaiah 1, Jeremiah 2, Hosea 1, Malachi 2), Psalms 1, Job 1.

The piel of *šmr* occurs only in Jon. 2:9(8); the hithpael occurs in 2 S. 22:24, Mic. 6:16, and Ps. 18:24(23).

All told, the vb. *šmr* occurs 468 times in the OT. If we analyze its distribution among the individual books, Deuteronomy (73 times) and the Psalms (71 times) stand out. Among the larger units, DtrH leads, with 85 occurrences. This number should be increased substantially, since many texts in Deuteronomy are indebted to the Dtr move-

39. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I,* 106.

40. Ahiqar 97,101,160; for a discussion of this work see J. M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (1983); I. Kottsieper, *Die Sprache der Aḥiqarsprüche. BZAW* 194 (1990).

41. Ll. 97,101; translation after Lindenberger, *Ahiqar,* 73, 81; in both instances, Kottsieper (*Sprache,* 20) has a different division and translation.

42. P. 161, following A. Ungnad, *Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine* (1911); for a different reading see *AP,* 218, 244; Kottsieper, *Sprache,* 10.

43. Similarly E. Martínez Borobio, in A. Díez Macho, ed., *Apócrifos del AT,* III (Madrid, 1982), 186.

44. Lindenberger, *Ahiqar,* 24; see II.2.a below.

45. *Ahiqar,* 161.

ment, and many passages from the Minor Prophets and the Psalms emanate from this movement or at least exhibit its influence. After DtrH, *šmr* occurs most frequently in the Priestly material and related texts such as Ezekiel. This distribution is even clearer if we concentrate on religious usage. A survey of the individual occurrences reveals that *šmr* in its religious and theological range of meanings is characteristic of late texts.

The nouns derived from *šmr* are less common: *'ašmûrâ/'ašmōreṯ* (7 times: Ex. 14:24; Jgs. 7:19; 1 S. 11:11; Ps. 63:7[6]; 90:4; 119:148; Lam. 2:19), *mišmār* (22 times: Genesis 6; Leviticus, Numbers, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, and Proverbs 1 each; Nehemiah 8; 1 Chronicles 2), *mišmereṯ*[46] (78 times), *šemer* (5 times: Isa. 25:6 [bis]; Jer. 48:11; Zeph. 1:12; Ps. 75:9[8]), *šᵉmurâ* (once: Ps. 77:5[4]), *šomrâ* (once: Ps. 141:3), *šimmurîm* (twice: Ex. 12:42).

2. *Parallelisms and Combinations.* Among the verbs used with *šmr* in parallelisms, *nṣr* and *zkr* stand out. We find the sequences *šmr — nṣr* (Dt. 33:9; Ps. 12:8[7]; 25:20-21; 105:45; 119:144-145; Prov. 2:11; 4:6; 5:2; 28:4,7) and *nṣr — šmr* (Ps. 78:7,10; 119:34; Prov. 2:8; 27:18; cf. also the close linking of the two verbs in Prov. 13:3 and 16:17). The vb. *zkr* can take on the same semantic value as *šmr*, even when the two are not parallel (Nu. 15:39-40; Ps. 103:18; 119:55), but *zkr* (like *šmr*) is followed by an infinitive of purpose, denoting a specific action (Ex. 20:8; Ps. 103:18; 109:16) or, finally, when *zkr* (as indicated by the context) has the same function as *šmr* (Josh. 1:13; Mal. 3:22).[47]

The relationships between *šmr*, *nṣr*, and *zkr* are fundamentally deeper than would appear at first glance, as a comparison with the terminology used in certain ancient Near Eastern treaties shows. The OT frequently speaks of "observing/keeping the covenant" *(šmr bᵉrîṯ).* In Akkadian keeping a covenant is sometimes expressed by means of the verbs *naṣāru* and *ḫasāsu*, which correspond to the Hebrew vbs. *nṣr* and *šmr/zkr*.[48] In the OT we find both *zākar bᵉrîṯ* (Lev. 26:45) and *šāmar bᵉrîṯ* (Gen. 17:9,10; Ex. 19:5; Dt. 7:9,12; 29:8[9]; 1 K. 8:23; 11:11; Ezk. 17:14; Ps. 78:10; 103:18; 132:12; Dnl. 9:4; Neh. 1:5; 9:32; 2 Ch. 6:14). And with the term *ḥeseḏ*, which often accompanies *bᵉrîṯ*, *nṣr* (Ex. 34:7), *šmr* (1 K. 3:6), and *zkr* (Jer. 2:2) are all used. It is clear that *nṣr* usually appears in poetic texts, while *šmr* is found primarily in narrative texts, where it has largely displaced *nṣr*. As Baltzer has shown, *šmr* is a constitutive element of the "statement of substance" or "general clause" of the so-called covenant formulary.[49]

The vb. *šmr* is often used in combination with another verb, either as a coordinate in the same form or as a qualifying infinitive with *lᵉ*. The most commonly used verb is *'āśâ: šmr la'ᵃśôṯ* (Gen. 18:19; Ex. 31:16; Dt. 5:1,32; 6:3,25; 7:11; 8:1; 11:22,32; 12:1; 13:1[12:32]; 15:5; 17:10,19; 19:9; 24:8; 28:1,15,58; 31:12; 32:46; Josh. 1:7,8; 22:5; 2 K. 17:37; 21:8; Ezk. 18:9; 20:21; 1 Ch. 22:13; 2 Ch. 33:8; 34:21,31), *šmr wᵉla'ᵃśôṯ*

46. → IX, 72-78.

47. F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 41.

48. M. Weinfeld, *JAOS* 93 (1973) 190-99.

49. Pp. 44-47.

(Dt. 24:8; 28:13; Josh. 23:6; Neh. 10:30[29]; 1 Ch. 29:19), *šmr wᵉʿāśâ* (Lev. 19:37; 20:8,22; 22:31; 25:18; 26:3; Dt. 4:6; 7:12; 16:12; 23:24[23]; 26:16; 29:8[9]; Isa. 56:1; Ezk. 11:20; 20:19; 36:27; 37:24 [cf. 43:11]; Neh. 1:9; 2 Ch. 19:7).

Almost half of the passages cited come from Deuteronomy, and a major portion of the rest appear in the sphere of influence of that book. Here the combination of *ʿāśâ* and *šāmar* is a stereotyped expression; although it appears also outside the Dtn/Dtr tradition, it is a characteristic element of Dtn parenesis.[50]

Among the other verbs that accompany *šmr, hālaḵ* deserves special mention: *šmr lāleḵeṯ* (Lev. 18:24; Dt. 8:6; 11:22; 19:19; Josh. 22:5; Jgs. 2:22; 1 K. 2:4; 6:12; 8:25; 2 K. 10:31; Ps. 78:10; 2 Ch. 6:16), *lāleḵeṯ (wᵉ)lišmōr* and the reverse sequence (Dt. 10:12-13; 26:17; 30:16; 1 K. 2:3; 8:58,61; 2 K. 23:3; Neh. 10:30[29]; 2 Ch. 34:31), as well as other constructions using the two verbs (Gen. 28:15,20; Lev. 20:22-23; 26:3; Dt. 4:2-3; 5:32-33; 13:5[4]; 28:9; Josh. 1:7-9; 24:17; 1 K. 3:6,14; 8:23; 9:4,6; 11:10,33-34,38; 14:8; 2 K. 17:13-15,19; Jer. 16:11; Ezk. 11:20; 18:17-19; 20:18-19,21; 36:27; 37:24; Am. 2:4; Mic. 6:16; Zec. 3:7; Mal. 3:14; Eccl. 4:17[5:1]; 2 Ch. 6:14; 7:17). We occasionally find *hālaḵ* in parallel with *šmr,* especially in certain poetic texts.

When we compare the texts of the *šmr-hālaḵ* group with those of the *šmr-ʿāśâ* group, it is easy to see how frequently the same formulas recur. We may conclude that behind these formulations there stands a tripartite formulation *šmr-hālaḵ-ʿāśâ.* This combination can be supplemented and defined more precisely through additional parallels.

Finally, the vb. *ṣwh*[51] also deserves special mention. This verb appears relatively frequently in the "promulgation formulas" characteristic of Deuteronomy. When such formulas are dependent on a main clause, in a significant number of cases the latter has *šmr* as its verb (Dt. 4:2,40; 6:2; 7:11; 8:1,11; 10:13; 11:8,22; 13:1[12:32]; 19:9; 27:1). In other cases the vb. *šmr* enters into a more or less close association with *šmʿ*, in such a way that the promulgation formula practically depends on both (Dt. 12:28; 13:19[18]; 15:5; 28:1,15 and 27:10; 30:8).

Most of the expressions made up of *šmr* and a noun belong to the lexical field of "law" or "covenant." To it should be added other terms from the domain of the cultic commandments.[52]

Other combinations using *šmr* are less common and are associated with a variety of contexts. In alphabetical order the terms used with *šmr* are: *ʾᵉmunîm* (Isa. 26:2), *ʾᵉmeṯ* (Ps. 146:6), *ʾorḥôṯ* (Ps. 17:4; Prov. 2:20; cf. Job 13:27; 33:11), *daʿaṯ* (Mal. 2:7), *haḇlê šāw'* (Ps. 31:7), *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ* (Job 14:16; cf. 10:14), *haḥeseḏ* (Dt. 7:9; 1 K. 3:6; 8:23; Hos. 12:7[6]; Ps. 89:29[28]; Dnl. 9:4; Neh. 1:5; 9:32; 2 Ch. 6:14), *lᵉšônô* (Prov. 21:23), *mûsār* (Prov. 10:17), *mᵉzimmôṯ* (Prov. 2:11; 5:2), *nepeš* (Dt. 4:9; Ps. 25:20; 71:10; 86:2; 97:10; 119:167; 121:7; Job 2:6; Prov. 13:3; 16:17; 19:16; 21:23; 22:5), *ʿeḇrâ* (Am.

50. Lohfink, 68-70.
51. → צוה *ṣwh.*
52. See IV.2 below.

1:11), *peh* (1 S. 1:12; Prov. 21:23; cf. Mic. 7:5; Ps. 39:2[1]; Eccl. 8:2), *rûaḥ* (Job 10:12; Eccl. 11:4), *šᵉḇuʻâ* (Dt. 7:8; 1 K. 2:43), *tôḵaḥaṯ* (Prov. 13:18; 15:5), *tām* (Ps. 37:37).

These texts exhibit the variety of the expressions and their particular concentration in the Psalms and in wisdom literature. At the same time, there is a clear contrast to the expressions using *šmr* in relationship to the law in Deuteronomy, DtrH and Chronicles, and priestly material (including Ezekiel).

III. Meaning.

1. *Verb.* In the qal *šmr* has the basic meaning "watch, guard, observe, fulfill, keep, keep watch, spy out." The variations in meaning and the different nuances are fundamentally dependent on the various subjects and objects, parallelisms, and contexts.

The most frequent subject of *šmr* is a human individual or collective. Individuals commonly named are the patriarchs, kings (esp. David and Solomon), and court officials. The most common collective subject is the people of Israel (*[bᵉnê] yiśrā'ēl*), especially in Deuteronomy. Less frequently, the Aaronides and Levites function as the subject in Leviticus and Numbers. God or an angel can also be the subject of *šmr.* In the Psalter and in Solomon's prayer of dedication (1 K. 8//2 Ch. 6), the most common subject is *yhwh* or *'ᵉlōhîm.*

The object of *šmr* can be anything of value in the material or spiritual world that is to be guarded, kept, or watched.

The vb. *šmr* is common in everyday language, appearing in a great variety of contexts, both secular and religious. As a result, its semantic field extends from the secular and concrete to the spiritual and religious.

In the niphal the verb usually conveys a reflexive sense and can be translated as "take heed, take care, be on one's guard against." It is especially common in the imperative with the meaning "Watch out! Beware!" In Hos. 12:14(13) it has the passive sense "be guarded"; it has the same sense in Ps. 37:28 (MT *nišmāru,* contra LXX[53]).

Of the 3 instances of the hithpael, 2 clearly have the meaning "keep oneself (from)": 2 S. 22:24//Ps. 18:24(23). In Mic. 6:16, however, the MT is obscure; its difficulty explains the divergent readings of the early versions.[54]

In the piel *šmr* takes on the meaning "worship," analogously to Akk. *šamāru(m).*[55]

2. *Nominal Derivatives.* With the exception of *šemer,* all the nouns derived from *šmr* stay within the same range of meanings as the verb.

The noun *'ašmûrâ/'ašmōreṯ* means "night watch"; the night is divided into three such watches: the first watch (*lᵉrō'š 'ašmōreṯ,* Lam. 2:19), the middle watch (*hā'ašmōreṯ hattîḵônâ,* Jgs. 7:19), and the morning watch (*'ašmōreṯ habbōqer,* Ex.

---

53. See VI.1 below.

54. B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée. ÉBib* (1977), 334-35; H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 187; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT,* III. *OBO* 50/3 (1992), 768-69. See also VI.1 below.

55. See I.1 above.

14:24; 1 S. 11:11).[56] While the last three passages are set in military contexts, the text in Lamentations involves a nighttime prayer at the beginning of the watches. In a similar vein the psalmist, seeking communion with God, quiet, and contemplation (Ps. 4:5[4]; 16:7; 119:148), finds the "watches of the night" an appropriate time for meditation and prayer (Ps. 63:7[6]; 90:4; 119:148).

The noun *mišmār* can have the broad meaning "guard, watch" (Job 7:12; Prov. 4:23), but as a rule it has a more specific meaning: (1) the place where people are kept under watch or guard, cell, prison (Gen. 40:3,4,7; 41:10; 42:17,19; Lev. 24:12; Nu. 15:34); (2) the military guard of a city (Jer. 51:12; Neh. 4:3,16,17[9,22,23]; 12:25); (3) the section of the temple kept separate by a curtain (Neh. 12:24; 13:14; 1 Ch. 26:16; cf. Ezk. 38:7).[57]

Both *šomrâ* and *šᵉmurâ* are hapax legomena. The former refers to the mouth, the latter to the eyes: "Set a guard over my mouth, O Yahweh" (*šomrâ lᵉpî*, Ps. 141:3); "You [God] control my eyelids" (*šᵉmurôṯ ʿênāyim*, Ps. 77:5[4]) in the sense of "keep awake." As one would expect, the vb. *šmr* with its basic meaning "observe, watch, etc." stands in close relationship to the organ of sight; some texts even use it in parallel with verbs like *rʾh* (Jer. 20:10; Ps. 56:7[6]; Job 24:15; 39:1; Eccl. 11:4). There is a similar relationship between *šmr* and *peh*.[58]

The noun *šimmurîm* (only in Ex. 12:42) refers to a vigil, the "night of watching."[59] During the night of Passover, Yahweh watched over Israel to guard and protect them while they left Egypt (v. 42a). This very night is therefore a vigil in honor of Yahweh for all Israelites throughout all generations (v. 42b). Hyatt interprets this "vigilance" in honor of Yahweh to mean keeping the Festival of Passover and fulfilling the commandments.[60] The text thus plays on the double meaning of *šmr*, "vigilance" and "observance."

The noun *šemer*, used only in its plural form *šᵉmārîm*, refers to the "lees" (of wine).[61] It is used figuratively — in a positive context in Isa. 25:6 and Jer. 48:11, in a negative context in Zeph. 1:12. In Ps. 75:9(8) it refers to God's anger, represented as poison in a cup that all the wicked must drink on the day of judgment. Isa. 25:6, by contrast, speaks of the fine wine that God will provide for the nations of the earth at the end of the ages.

IV. Qal.

1. *Concrete and Secular Usage.* In concrete and secular usage *šmr* refers primarily to physical actions and the persons who carry them out. In the latter case, as a rule, the ptcp. *šōmēr* is used.

---

56. *GesB*[18], 109; G. Dalman, *AuS*, I (1928), 631-32.

57. *HAL*, I, 649.

58. See II.2 above.

59. *HAL*, II, 1588.

60. J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus*. *NCBC* (repr. 1983), 140.

61. According to *HAL*, it may be a primary noun of unknown etymology, unrelated to *šmr*; Sauer (1380, 1383), however, lists *šemer* among the derivatives of *šmr*.

a. *Primary Uses.* In its literal sense *šmr* denotes the guarding or watching of persons, animals, or objects. Although the verb is part of everyday language, one can often recognize in the usage of *šmr* the way of life and specific occupations of a particular society — in the goods or values that are to be guarded or watched are reflected the characteristic interests of every social group.

For example, the patriarchal stories, which preserve memories of a pastoral civilization, speak of watching or "feeding" the flock (*šmr,* Gen. 30:31; cf. Hos. 12:13[12] with reference to Jacob). The story of Joseph, by contrast, reflects the agricultural civilization of Egypt when instructions are given to "lay up" (*šmr,* Gen. 41:35). The Covenant Code, similarly, which presupposes a settled society living on the produce of its own land and its flocks, as well as on trade, cites certain circumstances under which personal property is given to someone for safekeeping (Ex. 22:6,9[7,10]); it also cites cases in which an owner must "restrain" *(šmr)* his ox (Ex. 21:29,36).

The literature of P uses *šmr* to denote functions to be carried out in the context of the sanctuary.[62] It also requires keeping watch over the furnishings of the tent of meeting (Nu. 3:8).

The books of Samuel and Kings, which concentrate wholly on the problems of the monarchy and reflect the typical concerns of an urban culture, use *šmr* primarily to reflect these concerns. The palace is looked after or guarded (2 S. 15:16; 16:21; 20:3; 2 K. 11:5-6; cf. 1 K. 14:27); the person of the king must be guarded (1 S. 19:11; 26:15-16), as well as his property (1 S. 9:14; 17:22) and other persons more or less closely connected with the palace (2 S. 18:12; 1 K. 20:39).

Finally, the Psalms and some of the sapiential books that are interested in spiritual and intellectual qualities use a series of expressions (in many of which *šmr* has a figurative sense) that bespeak the world and the special interests of certain hagiographers and the society they address.[63]

In the wide range of usage of the vb. *šmr,* consequently, the sociocultural background of the texts in which it appears represents a unifying principle. Every organized society ultimately creates a defensive system to protect what it values. This need accounts for the variety of functions and persons charged with such duties in the various elements of society. Some of these are associated with the nominalized ptcp. *šōmēr.*

b. *Participle.* The ptcp. *šōmēr* means "watchman, guardian" in general (Isa. 21:11,12; 62:6; Jer. 51:12; Ps. 121:3-5; 127:1; 130:6). Often *šōmēr* is specified as the watch guarding a field (*šmr śāḏeh,* Jer. 4:17), a forest (*šmr happardēs,* Neh. 2:8), a house (*šmr habbayiṯ,* Eccl. 12:3), or the harem (*šmr hannāšîm,* Est. 2:3,8,15; *šmr happîlagšîm,* Est. 2:14). The *šōmēr* may be a bodyguard (*šmr lᵉrōʾš,* 1 S. 28:2), a gatekeeper (*šmr šaʿar,* Neh. 3:29), or the keeper of the wardrobe (*šmr habbᵉgāḏîm,* 2 K. 22:14//2 Ch. 34:22).

The town guards, the royal guards, and the temple guards deserve special mention. Many guards were needed to keep watch over a town, since towns were the most im-

62. → משמרת *mišmereṯ;* see IV.2 and IV.5 below.

63. See II.2 above.

portant targets of enemies. For example, Joab keeps watch over besieged Rabbah (*šmr ʼel-hāʻîr,* 2 S. 11:16), and Joram defends Ramoth-gilead from Hazael, the king of Aram (*hāyâ šōmēr berāmōṯ gilʻāḏ,* 2 K. 9:14). Cant. 3:3 and 5:7a speak of the sentinels (*meṣāʼûnî haššōmerîm*) making their rounds and patrolling the walls (*šōmerê haḥōmôṯ,* 5:7b).[64]

The kings of Israel had their own guards. At the beginning of the monarchy, in the reign of Saul, we already hear of Saul's "runners" (*rāṣîm,* 1 S. 22:17), who constitute the escort preceding the king's chariot, a personal royal guard. In 2 K. 11:4,19, they are mentioned alongside Carite mercenaries. Both groups fill the office of palace guard in Jerusalem (*šōmerê mišmereṯ bêṯ hammeleḵ,* 2 K. 11:5). According to 1 K. 14:27-28// 2 Ch. 12:10-11, the "officers of the runners" (*śārê hārāṣîm*) guard the entrance to the royal palace (*haššōmerîm peṯaḥ bêṯ hammeleḵ*). The personnel of the guard were so numerous that they could be organized into divisions of a hundred (2 K. 11:4-6,11,19), and they played a significant military role. In 2 K. 11 we see the leading role they played in the deposition of Athaliah and the enthronement of Joash.[65]

The expression *šōmerê mišmereṯ,* which denotes the palace guard in 2 K. 11:5, refers primarily to the officials (priests, Levites) who are charged with duties within the temple (*šōmerê mišmereṯ haqqōḏeš,* Nu. 3:28,32; *šōmerê mišmereṯ miškan yhwh,* Nu. 31:30,47; *šōmerê mišmereṯ habbāyiṯ/hammizbēaḥ,* Ezk. 40:45,46; 44:8,14). The noun *mišmereṯ*[66] became a technical term for ministry in the sanctuary, the tent of meeting, or the temple. The noun *mišmār,* too, can refer to persons who watch over the section of the temple separated by a curtain.[67] The expression *šōmerê hassap̱,* "guardians of the threshold (of the house of God)," refers to high officials of the temple (2 K. 23:4; 25:18//Jer. 52:24), whom Joash appointed to receive the contributions of the people (2 K. 12:10). These guardians of the threshold in the monarchic period must not be confused with the simple doorkeepers of the postexilic period, as 2 Ch. 34:9 seems to do by using the same expression *šōmerê hassap̱.* In the view of the Chronicler, the doorkeepers were clearly Levites.

2. *Figurative and Religious Usage.* The majority of OT texts use the vb. *šmr* in abstract or religious contexts.The contextual meaning of *šmr* in concrete and secular usage has already cast light on the particular concrete or social group in question; similarly, behind the abstract and religious usage of *šmr* we can also discern the contours of the people of God and the covenant community. The mutual obligations of the covenant find expression in various formulas in which the vb. *šmr* plays an important role, with the basic meaning "observe, obey."

a. *Formulas.* The semantic contribution of *šmr* is usually particularized either by a second verb[68] or by a direct object. Most of the nouns used as direct objects belong to

64. See the discussion of *mišmār* and *ʼašmûrâ/ʼašmōreṯ* in III.2 above.
65. R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 123, 221.
66. → משמרת *mišmereṯ.*
67. See III.2 above.
68. See II.2 above.

the lexical field of "covenant" and "law." The following list of the most important objects begins with those terms that have a religious or ethical dimension, followed by those that appear more or less commonly in the religious or cultic milieu.[69] It concludes with a few isolated examples.

The first group includes the following:

(1.α) *šmr miṣwōṯ:* Gen. 26:5; Ex. 16:28; 20:6; Lev. 22:31; 26:3; Dt. 4:2,40; 5:10,29; 6:2,17; 7:9; 8:2,6,11; 10:13; 11:1; 13:5,19(4,18);[70] 26:17,18; 28:1,9,13,15,45; 30:10,16; Josh. 22:5; 1 K. 2:3; 3:14; 6:12; 8:58,61; 9:6; 11:34,38; 14:8; 2 K. 17:13,19; 18:6; 23:3; (Jer. 35:18); Ps. 89:32(31); 119:60; (Prov. 4:4; 7:2); Eccl. 12:13; Dnl. 9:4; Neh. 1:5,7,9; 10:30; 1 Ch. 28:8; 29:19; 2 Ch. 34:31.

(1.β) *šmr miṣwâ:* Dt. 6:25; 7:11; 8:1; 11:8,22; 15:5; 19:9; 27:1; (Josh. 22:3); 1 S. 13:13; 1 K. 13:21; 2 K. 17:37; Prov. 19:16; (cf. Eccl. 8:5).

(2.α) *šmr ḥuqqîm:* Ex. 15:26; Dt. 4:40; 5:1; 6:17; 7:11; 11:32; 12:1; 16:12; 17:19; 26:16,17; 1 K. 3:14; 8:58; 9:4; 2 K. 17:37; Am. 2:4; Mal. 3:7; Ps. 105:45; 119:5,8; Neh. 1:7; 10:30(29); 1 Ch. 22:13; 29:19; 2 Ch. 7:17; 34:31.

(2.β) *šmr ḥuqqôṯ:* Gen. 26:5; Lev. 18:4,5,26; 19:19,37; 20:8,22; Dt. 6:2; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 28:15,45; 30:10,16; 1 K. 2:3; 9:6; 11:11,34,38; 2 K. 17:13; 23:3; Ezk. 18:19,21; 37:24; 44:24.

(2.γ) *šmr ḥōq:* Ps. 97:7.

(3.α) *šmr mišpāṭîm:* Lev. 18:5,26; 19:37; 20:22; 25:18; Dt. 5:1; 7:11,12; 8:11; 11:1,32; 12:1; 26:16,17; 30:16; 1 K. 2:3; 8:58; 9:4; 2 K. 17:37; Ezk. 11:20; 18:9; 20:19,21; 36:27; Ps. 19:12(11) (cf. v. 10[9]); 119:106; Neh. 1:7; 10:30(29); 1 Ch. 22:13; 2 Ch. 7:17.

(3.β) *šmr mišpāṭ:* Isa. 56:1; Hos. 12:7(6); Ps. 106:3.

(4.α) *šmr d^eḇārîm:* Dt. 12:28; 17:19; 28:58; 29:8(9); 31:12; 32:46; Ps. 119:57; Prov. 4:20,21.

(4.β) *šmr dāḇār:* Ex. 12:24; Dt. 13:1(12:32); Ps. 119:17,101; 1 Ch. 10:13; 2 Ch. 34:21.

(5.α) *šmr tôrâ:* 2 K. 17:37; Jer. 16:11; Ps. 119:34,44,55,136; (Prov. 7:2; 28:4: 29:18); 1 Ch. 22:12.

(5.β) *šmr tôrôṯ:* Gen. 26:5; Ex. 16:28; Ezk. 44:24.

(6.α) *šmr ʻēḏôṯ:* Dt. 6:17; Ps. 78:56; 99:7; 119:146,167,168; 132:12 (cf. Ps. 119:88).

(6.β) *šmr ʻēḏûṯ:* 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 23:3; 1 Ch. 29:19; 2 Ch. 34:31.

(7) *šmr b^erîṯ:* Gen. 17:9,10; Ex. 19:5; (Dt. 28:9; Ezk. 17:14); Ps. 78:10; 103:18; 132:12 (cf. 2 Ch. 34:31).

(8) *šmr dereḵ (yhwh):* Gen. 18:19; Ps. 37:34; Job 23:11.

(9) *šmr p^equddâ:* Ps. 119:4,63,134,168.

(10) *šmr 'imrâ:* Dt. 33:9; Ps. 119:67,158 (cf. Prov. 4:20,21; 7:1).

(11.α) *šmr mišmereṯ (yhwh):* Gen. 26:5; Lev. 8:35; 18:30; 22:9; Nu. 9:19,23; Dt.

69. Cf. Langlamet, 327-28.

70. P. E. Dion, "Deuteronomy 13," in B. Halpern and D. W. Hobson, eds., *Laws and Ideology in Monarchic Israel. JSOTSup* 124 (1991), 152, 170-72.

11:1; (Josh. 22:3); 1 K. 2:3; Ezk. 44:8,16; 48:11; Zec. 3:7; Mal. 3:14; (Neh. 12:45); 2 Ch. 13:11; 23:6.

(11.β) *šmr mišmereṯ:* Nu. 1:53; 3:7,8,28,32,38; 8:26; 18:3,4,5; 31:30,47; Josh. 22:3; 2 K. 11:5,6,7; Ezk. 40:45,46; 44:14,15; Neh. 12:45; 1 Ch. 23:32.

In the second group, we may distinguish three subgroups:

(1) The passages that speak of keeping a festival and its observances: Ex. 12:17(bis),24,25; 13:10; 23:15; 34:18; Dt. 16:1.

(2) The passages that refer to keeping the Sabbath: Ex. 31:13,14,16; Lev. 19:3,30; 26:2; Dt. 5:12; Isa. 56:2,4,6.

(3) The passages that deal with the priestly office (*šmr kᵉhunnâ,* Nu. 3:10; 18:7) and sacrificial offerings (*qorbān,* Nu. 28:2).

The third group comprises less homogeneous expressions: *šmr 'ᵉmunîm* (Isa. 26:2), *šmr 'orḥôṯ* (Ps. 17:4; Prov. 2:20), *šmr da'aṯ* (Mal. 2:7), *šmr mûsār* (Prov. 10:17), *šmr tôḵēḥâ* (Prov. 13:18; 15:5), *šmr tām* (Ps. 37:37).

In all these groups the subject of *šmr* is human. The direct objects, however, differ significantly. The analysis that follows will distinguish six textual groups: (b) Deuteronomy, (c) DtrH, (d) ChrH; (e) P and Ezekiel; (f) the Psalms; and (g) sapiential works.

b. *Deuteronomy.* The texts in our first block underscore once again the remarkable importance of *šmr* in Deuteronomy and its related books. The frequent use of the dyad *šmr — 'śh* with various objects in Deuteronomy obviously arises from the need to stress obedience to the commandments and the obligations of the covenant.[71] There can be no doubt that we have here one of the primary motifs of Deuteronomy, which influenced DtrH, where it found its continuation.

In Deuteronomy *šmr* appears primarily in texts of the Dtn recension in the time of Josiah and the exile.[72] Here *šmr* is often an integral part of the parenetic formulas placed regularly at the beginning and/or end of textual units to introduce and/or emphasize precepts, blessings, curses, etc. We see here an effective literary technique used to emphasize and inculcate certain ideas.

In this connection four texts of the Dtn recension may be singled out: Dt. 7:8-12; 8:2-6; 10:12-13; 11:1. In Dt. 7:8b-11,12b, the vb. *šmr* appears 4 times. It is clearly a thematic term that plays an important role in defining the structure of the textual unit: (1) *šōmēr habbᵉrîṯ wᵉhaḥeseḏ* (v. 9bβ*); (2) *lᵉ'ōhᵃḇāyw ûlᵉšōmᵉrê miṣwôṯāyw* (v. 9bβ*); (2′) *wᵉšāmartā 'eṯ-hammiṣwâ* (v. 11); (1′) *wᵉšāmar . . . 'eṯ-habbᵉrîṯ wᵉ'eṯ-haḥeseḏ* (v. 12b). The vb. *šmr* in v. 9bβ is dependent on v. 9bα, which is itself closely linked to vv. 8b and 9a: recollection of what Yahweh has done for Israel must lead to recognition that Yahweh is the faithful God. Other formulas in this textual unit likewise insist on Yahweh's faithfulness toward Israel and draw the necessary conclusion: Israel's obligation to keep the commandments. Observance or transgression has critical consequences for Israel (vv. 9b-11). In this context emphasis on punishment is a pedagogical technique characteristic of the Dtn redaction.[73]

---

71. See II.2 above.

72. García López, *RB* 84 (1977) 509-13; 85 (1978) 5-49; 86 (1979) 64-65, 83-91.

73. For further details on Dt. 7 see F. García López, *VT* 32 (1982) 438-63; Achenbach, 225-34.

In Dt. 8:2-6[74] the two occurrences of *šmr* (vv. 2b,6) again play a structural role.[75] The wilderness is a place of testing: Yahweh made Israel travel the wilderness way in order that Israel might learn the way of the law. Here the whole semantic spectrum of *šmr* is accurately comprehended: Israel is to be led to acknowledge what Yahweh has done and to keep *(šmr)* his commandments. One does not live by bread alone, but by everything that comes from the mouth of Yahweh (*môṣāʾ pî-yhwh:* v. 3), i.e., by the commandments *(miṣwōṯ)*, the life-giving word of God. The expression *šmr miṣwōṯ* in v. 6a is constructed in parallelism with the expression *lāleḵeṯ biḏrāḵāyw* in v. 6b. The latter in turn constitutes a chiasm with *hadderek̲ . . . hōlîk̲ᵃk̲ā* in v. 2a. The network of relationships in this unit is clear: the way through the wilderness is to lead Israel in the ways of God; the manna, on which the life of the people in the wilderness depended, is to lead Israel to recognize that its life now depends on God's word, i.e., observance of God's commandments.

In 7:8b-11,12b and in 8:2-6, we also find the fundamental relationship between keeping the commandments and Yahweh's love (7:9b-10; 8:6), like the relationship between keeping the commandments and the blessings that result. Israel's faithfulness to Yahweh is grounded in Yahweh's love and faithfulness toward Israel, manifested in his mighty acts in history (7:8b,9-11; 8:2-5). Yahweh proves a thousand times over to be a merciful God, though not without punishing disobedience. Obedience to Yahweh secures a long life, but disobedience leads to death. This more or less explicit contrast serves to strengthen Israel's faithfulness, underscored by *šmr.*

These motifs recur in a different literary form in 10:12-13 and 11:1 as a frame surrounding the vb. *šmr,* to emphasize its importance and theological depth. Baltzer's analysis of the "covenant formulary"[76] shows quite clearly that *šmr* is a constitutive element of its "general clause" or "statement of substance." At the same time *šmr* is an integral part of the "particular provisions." Criticism of Baltzer's thesis notwithstanding,[77] several texts in Deuteronomy exhibit a connection between "general clause" and the "individual provisions." Specifically, the texts of 10:12-13 and 11:1 must be examined from this perspective.

In 10:12-13 the commandments are mentioned after a series of formulas concerning the great commandment, which represents the formal object of all obedience: Yahweh requires Israel to walk in all his ways, love him, and serve him by keeping *(lišmōr)* all his commandments. Analogously, 11:1 equates love of God with observance of the commandments: *wᵉʾāhaḇtā ʾeṯ yhwh ʾᵉlōheyk̲ā wᵉšāmartā mišmartô* (cf. also vv. 13,22). The great commandment and the individual commandments stand in a relationship such that the corresponding formulas are interchangeable: obedience to the commandments implies fearing, loving, and serving Yahweh; ergo fear, love, and service of Yahweh must be realized in observance of the commandments. Merely to keep the commandments without a true inward commitment is not enough: it leads to superfici-

74. Achenbach, 312-20.

75. F. García López, "Yahvé, fuente última de vida," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 21-54.

76. Pp. 44-47.

77. D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant. AnBibl* 21A (1978), 6.

ality. On the other hand, ostensible obedience to God without obedience to the law would be a chimera. The texts of Deuteronomy mean to highlight the fact that they are concerned with fundamental principles for the religious life of Israel.

Sometimes the great commandment stands in parallel with the particular statutes; at other times it stands in a subordinate construction using *l*ᵉ with the infinitive construct, e.g., "fear Yahweh, love Yahweh . . . keeping *(lšmr)* his commandments," or the reverse, "keep *(šmr)* the commandments, fearing, loving *(yr', 'hb)*. . . ." This construction emphasizes the fundamental importance of the great commandment, which directs the observance of all particular statutes (*w*ᵉ*šāmartā 'eṯ-miṣwōṯ yhwh* ᵉ*'lōheyḵā lāleḵeṯ biḏrāḵāyw ûl*ᵉ*yir'â 'ōṯô*, 8:6; cf. also 11:13,22; 12:28; 19:9). In the cases of parallelism (10:12-13; 11:1; cf. also 5:29; 6:2; 8:11; 13:19[18]; 15:5; 16:12; 17:19; 28:1,15; 30:10,16; 31:12 — all texts with *šmr*), the accent is on the individual statutes as a necessary means of fulfilling the great commandment scrupulously.

In sum we may say that the *šmr* texts of Deuteronomy emphasize the reciprocal relationship between Israel and Yahweh, the relationship between the great commandment and the individual statutes, and the connection between obedience/disobedience and blessing/curse. All these elements, fundamental to Deuteronomy's vision, reappear in one form or another in DtrH.

c. *DtrH.* In DtrH the vb. *šmr* plays a crucial role as an expression of obedience and faithfulness toward Yahweh and his law. Its frequency in focal passages points to a conscious plan on the part of a redactor.

From the Dtr perspective, the leaders of God's people play a central role as guarantors of the covenant. They safeguard the way of Israel into the promised land. To defend itself from its enemies, Israel had to obey the commandments and trust in Yahweh. It was the duty of the kings to fulfill this mission, like Moses and Joshua before them.[78] The various Dtr texts with *šmr* must be seen in this setting.

In the very middle of the Dtn "law of the king" (Dt. 17:14-20), two typically Dtr verse have been interpolated,[79] which state that when the king takes the throne, he is to have a copy of the law written for him and read in it all the days of his life, "that he may learn to fear Yahweh his God, observing *(šmr)* all the words of this law and these statutes, so as to keep them *(la'ᵃśōṯām)*" (v. 19b). This is clearly a programmatic text placed by the Dtr redactor at the beginning of his work to serve as a model, a kind of mirror in which the various kings of Israel may see themselves reflected and judge themselves by its light. The law of Moses is thus the norm par excellence. Its observance is set in parallel with the fear of Yahweh. The great commandment here appears in perfect coordination with the individual statutes.

The second important Dtr occurrence of *šmr* appears in the section that describes the final instructions of Moses and his death (Dt. 31–34). Joshua is appointed to succeed Moses as military commander and leader of the people (31:1-8,14-15,23); the

---

78. G. E. Gerbrandt, *Kingship According to the Deuteronomistic History. SBLDS* 87 (1986), 123.

79. F. García López, "Le roi d'Israël," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium. BETL* 68 (1985) 277-97.

written text of the law and a song exhorting the people to fulfill the law are left as mediators of the law and of the covenant (31:9-13,16-22; 32). In 31:9-13, in the context of the law and covenant, the vb. *šmr* appears in a solemn summons to assemble all the people "that they may listen and learn by heart and fear Yahweh your God and diligently observe all the statutes of this instruction" (v. 12b). Clearly we have here the same programmatic formulas as in 17:18-19.

Finally, after the song has been recited in the presence of the whole assembly (31:30; 32:1-43), "He [Moses] said to them, 'Carefully observe all the statutes. Today I adjure you: require of your children that they too observe and keep all the statutes of this instruction" (32:45-46). The repetition of this command almost word for word in 31:12 shows that the Song of Moses is associated with the law. Both are esteemed as authentic words of life: the law, which outlines how life should be lived, and the song, which condemns sin. The life of the people depends on fulfillment of the law; its transgression brings death. This law is presented here in the closest possible association with the covenant. The written law is the protocol that is kept in a holy place and recited regularly or on special occasions (31:9-11; cf. also 33:9). As a consequence, this section contains several key terms around which many other texts of the DtrH orbit.

In the book of Joshua the vb. *šmr* appears 3 times in the qal with the meaning "observe, obey": at the beginning and end of the book, at the beginning and end of Joshua's career. The first and third passages (Josh. 1:7-8; 23:6) are part of the great discourses characteristic of DtrH; the second is linked formally and thematically with the other two. Josh. 1:1-9 records the words of God to Joshua, in which the latter is addressed as both Moses' successor and as a precursor of the kings (cf. 1 K. 2:1-9). This discourse includes a parenesis with an exhortation (v. 6a) and a promise (v. 6b), reinforced by emphasis on fulfilling the commandments given through Moses: "Be strong and courageous, being careful to act in accordance with all the instruction *(lišmōr la'ᵃśôṯ kᵉḵol-hattôrâ)* that my servant Moses commanded you. . . . You shall speak of this law always and meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to act in accordance with all that is written in it" (vv. 7aα,8a). Joshua is the first leader who is required — like a king (cf. Dt. 17:18-19) — to keep the law and see that others keep it.

In Josh. 23 the fundamental requirements for life in the promised land are formulated, beginning with observance of the law (v. 6a). This text clearly recalls 1:7-8. Formulated as a farewell address of Joshua, 22:1-6 uses the same argumentation to take stock of the past, in the people's favor (v. 2a; cf. v. 3b). At the same time, looking to the future, Joshua admonishes the people faithfully to follow the law of Moses: "Take good care to fulfill the commandment and law that Moses the servant of Yahweh commanded you: to love Yahweh your God, to walk in all his ways, to keep his commandments, to hold fast to him, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul" (v. 5). Once again we have the same concentration of terms, vehemently exhorting faithfulness to Yahweh and to his laws. The vb. *šmr* is repeated 4 times in this last text (vv. 2,3,5[bis]); beyond doubt it takes on a unique theological importance.

Of the two texts in the book of Judges that use *šmr* in the sense of "obey" (Jgs. 2:22;

13:14), only the first belongs to the Dtr redaction (the second is a special case in the Samson cycle). Jgs. 2:22 stands in one of the programmatic discourses of DtrH;[80] it is connected with ch. 23 in the sense that the people have broken the covenant given through Joshua (2:11-12; cf. ch. 23). According to Soggin, 2:20-23 contains a series of additions to vv. 11-19.[81] Dietrich assigns them to the nomistic redactor, DtrN.[82] The transgression of the covenant has provoked the anger of Yahweh (v. 20b), who does not — as expected — hand over the entire territory of Canaan to Israel, thus punishing Israel for its sins: the alien nations are to "test Israel, whether they will take care to walk in the way of Yahweh as their fathers did" (v. 22). Here the relationship of 2:20-22 to the covenant and its association with keeping the law comes to the fore, as was also the case in Dt. 31:9-13.

In DtrH Moses and David tower over all other figures, no matter how representative. The vb. *šmr* is not particularly frequent in the story of David, but it appears at points that are theologically and structurally significant: in the story of David's accession (1 S. 13:13,14) and the succession narrative (2 S. 22:22; 23:5; 1 K. 2:2-4). In DtrH 1 S. 13:13-14 is a significant text, since it records the first use of *nāgîḏ* as a title for David, giving him and his dynasty divine legitimation. The election of David stands in contrast to the rejection of Saul. Samuel declares that Saul's rule is at an end, because he has not kept the commandment of Yahweh (v. 13bα*; cf. v. 14bβ). Yahweh is pleased with David, however, because — as 2 S. 22:22,24 (//Ps. 18:22,24[21,24]) declares — he keeps the ways of Yahweh (*šāmar darḵê yhwh,* v. 22) and keeps himself from sin (*šmr* [hithpael] *mēʿᵃwōn,* v. 24). David thus appears as an upright man, totally faithful and without flaw. His righteousness is not his alone but is shared by all his descendants. From this perspective, the last words of David in 2 S. 23:1-7 serve as a summary of the psalm just cited: "Because he has made with me an everlasting covenant, it [my house] is ordered in all things and secure" (*ʿᵃrûḵâ ḇakkōl ûšᵉmûrâ,* v. 5b). Some scholars claim to find here traces of DtrN.[83] The association of *šmr* with law and covenant supports this identification, although details yet to be analyzed suggest caution. David and Moses are related in that the "Davidic covenant" continues and particularizes the "Mosaic covenant."[84]

David's words to Solomon in 1 K. 2:1-9 are formally very similar to Josh. 1:1-9.[85] The purpose of the text is to show that the Davidic dynasty is an institution in accord with God's will. The parenesis (exhortation, v. 2b; dynastic promise, v. 4aα,b) has been expanded by the addition of a reference to the commandments ("and you shall keep the law of Yahweh . . . walking in his ways to keep his commandments," v. 3a) and a generalization of the promise (v. 3b). The vb. *šmr* is repeated three times in vv. 3-4, where

80. M. Noth, *DH,* 20-24.

81. J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1981), 42, following W. Richter, *Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in den deuteronomistischen Epoche. BBB* 21 (1964), 36-38, 44.

82. P. 68 n. 6.

83. T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AnAcScFen* B 193 (1975), 120-24.

84. D. J. McCarthy, *JBL* 84 (1965) 136-37; Gerbrandt, *Kingship,* 168-69.

85. See above.

terms associated with the law are also concentrated. Observance of the *tôrâ* is a necessary condition for fulfillment of the dynastic promise (v. 4).

In the story of Solomon (1 K. 3–11), the frequent use of *šmr* attracts attention: it appears 15 times, including 4 with Yahweh as subject. The focal point of this story is in the chapters devoted to the temple (1 K. 6–8), which are framed by visions on the part of Solomon (3:4-15; 9:1-9). Here and in 1 K. 11 are concentrated all the occurrences of *šmr.* In 3:14 a long life is promised, provided that the law is kept *(lišmōr ḥuqqay).* The building of the temple, which marks a new stage in the history of Israel, makes sense only if it is an expression of obedience toward God. Therefore the text recalls the dynastic promise made to David (2 S. 7; 1 K. 6:12). The building of the temple is a demonstration of God's faithfulness to the promise to David. This promise was made unconditionally, but the emphasis on the covenant as an expression of God's faithfulness presupposes faithfulness on the part of the people. In Dtr theology, by contrast, the dynastic promise is linked to conditions. According to 1 K. 8:25, the promise made by Nathan is dependent on faithful obedience to the law. Yahweh's keeping of his word (*šmr,* v. 25a) is dependent on Israel keeping their obligations (*šmr,* v. 25b). Faithfulness is not simply something the people do; it is an act of God, who inclines the hearts of the people to keep his commandments (*lišmōr miṣwōṯāyw,* v. 58; cf. v. 61, with similar terminology).

The same theme reappears in 1 K. 9:4,6: an enduring dynasty is assured if the *tôrâ* is observed. Here too David is the model of obedience and faithfulness toward Yahweh (v. 4). Solomon's heart, however, turned away from Yahweh (11:9) and he became unfaithful (*lō' šāmar,* 11:10-11). Therefore Yahweh takes the kingship from Solomon, albeit neither totally nor immediately, out of love for his father David (vv. 12-13), who proved faithful (*'ašer šāmar miṣwōṯay weḥuqqōṯay,* v. 34). Here the humbled house of David is compared with the blessed house of Jeroboam. It is Yahweh's will to make of Jeroboam an enduring dynasty like that of David, if he obeys in all matters (v. 38). Once again (4 occurrences of *šmr* in 1 K. 11), the importance of obedience to the law is underlined.

The history of the divided kingdom begins in 1 K. 12 and culminates in 2 K. 17. The latter chapter represent a highpoint in DtrH:[86] here the vb. *šmr* stands out in remarkable relief. The historian contrasts the figures of David, the symbol of faithfulness, and Jeroboam, the symbol of unfaithfulness. In 1 K. 14:8b Jeroboam is characterized as a kind of "anti-David." Yahweh had given him the kingship under the condition that he keep the law like David (11:38; 14:8a); now Yahweh will take it from him, because he no longer keeps the commandments like his father (14:8b). A similar fate befalls Jehu, who is not careful to follow the law (2 K. 10:31). Finally, in the eyes of the Deuteronomist, the fall of Samaria is the consequence of Israel's sin, its enduring refusal to heed the admonitions given by Yahweh through the prophets: "Turn[87] from your evil ways and keep my commandments" (2 K. 17:13). From this perspective, the role of the prophets is more to preach the law than to foretell disaster.

---

86. F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 281.
87. → שׁוּב *šûḇ.*

In 2 K. 17:34-41 the nature of Israel's sin is explored. This textual unit exhibits a concentric structure: a/a′: "to this day" (vv. 34aα/41bβ); b/b′: former customs (vv. 34aβ/40); c/c′: covenant (vv. 35aα/38a); d/d′: great commandment (vv. 35aγ/37b); e: individual statutes (v. 37a). This passage has a hortatory character, similar in form and content to the parenetic texts of Deuteronomy. The catchword "covenant" joins the great commandment and the individual statutes, which occupy the central place in the exhortation (v. 37). Most striking is the unique combination of religious (awe of the sacred, punctilious performance of the cult) and moral fear (observance of the statutes).

The protagonists in the final section of the books of Kings (2 K. 18–25) are Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah. In the descriptions of their reigns, *šmr* appears regularly (18:6; 21:8; 23:3). Hezekiah was upright and without blemish: he did what was good and held fast to Yahweh (18:6). The reign of Manasseh, however, was marked by disobedience, since he led the people to turn away from Yahweh (21:8-9). Josiah is presented as a "new David,"[88] purifying the cult of the abuses introduced by Jeroboam and Manasseh and renewing the covenant with Yahweh. Like Moses and Joshua in their own day, Josiah acts as covenant mediator (23:3). Under Josiah, who observed the law of Moses in all points (23:25), the Mosaic covenant achieves new vitality.

Does the usage of *šmr* in DtrH actually suggest the concrete plan of a redactor? The clear concentration of its occurrences in the sections analyzed appears not to be accidental but to reflect a conscious plan. The series of repetitive formulations, the constant style of argumentation, and the theology behind the *šmr* texts encourage the notion of an actual redactor whose purpose is to emphasize obedience to the law and faithfulness to accepted obligations — someone who thinks nomistically. But because we have been able to examine only a few passages, it would be premature to argue the existence of a nomistic redactor as postulated by Smend,[89] Dietrich,[90] Veijola,[91] or, most recently, O'Brien.[92] Nevertheless, the results of our analysis point in that direction. Quite apart from this question, we have observed the enormous literary and theological importance of the vb. *šmr* throughout the entire DtrH.

d. *ChrH.* Both the theology and the terminology of Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1-2 Chronicles suggest the presence of a common idea in these books. Here too the vb. *šmr* is associated with set expressions that all reflect a common redaction. These are usually formulas that are inspired either by Deuteronomy or by DtrH (Neh. 1:5,7,9; 9:32; 10:30[29]; 2 Ch. 19:7) or that repeat (almost) verbatim material found in 1-2 Kings (2 Ch. 6:14-16//1 K. 8:23-25; 2 Ch. 7:17//1 K. 9:4; 2 Ch. 33:8//2 K. 21:8). In addition, a third group of texts displays certain significant variations when compared to Deuteronomy and DtrH. For example, in 1 Ch. 10:13 the Chronicler expresses his judgment on the death of Saul, which he understands as a punishment for Saul's unfaithfulness toward Yahweh and failure to keep the word of Yahweh *(ʿal-dᵉḇar yhwh ʾašer lōʾ-šāmār).*

---

88. R. D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History. JSOTSup* 18 (1981), 28.
89. P. 98.
90. P. 68 n. 6.
91. Veijola, *Ewige Dynastie,* 120-24.
92. M. A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. OBO* 92 (1989), 86-89, 280-82.

In 2 Ch. 34:21 a similar formulation is used in connection with Josiah. The expression *šmr dbr yhwh* never appears in DtrH (2 K. 22:13bβ, the parallel to 2 Ch. 34:21bβ, uses *šmʿ* instead of *šmr* and *ʿal diḇrê hassēp̄er hazzeh* instead of *ʾeṯ-d^eḇar yhwh*); it appears just once in Dt. 13:1 in a different formulation. This stylistic feature may point to a certain originality on the part of the Chronicler. In 1 Ch. 22:12-13; 28:8; 29:18-19 (all without parallel in DtrH), similarly, a variety of expressions using *šmr* appear. All of them emphasize the picture of David drawn by the Deuteronomist, representing the preparations for building the temple and the organization of the cult as David's last and greatest work and highlighting David's faithfulness to Yahweh and unblemished observance of the law. The Chronicler's purpose is thus to accentuate even further the aspects presented by the Deuteronomist.

e. *P and Ezekiel.* In texts belonging to P and Ezekiel, *šmr* usually has as its object *mišmereṯ* (17 times in P, 7 in Ezekiel), *ḥuqqôṯ* (7 times in P, 4 in Ezekiel), or *mišpāṭîm* (4 times in P, 5 in Ezekiel). In 2 P texts *šmr* appears with *b^erîṯ* and in 6 with *šabbāṯ;* in 6 others it appears in connection with festivals, rites, priestly ministry, and sacrificial offerings. These observations highlight certain characteristic features of P and Ezekiel, which distinguish them from the Dtn/Dtr traditions analyzed above.

The frequent use of *šmr* with *mišmereṯ,* which normally refers to regulations of a cultic nature, reveals the liturgical background of these texts. The same background is indicated by the relatively frequent use of *šmr* with nouns belonging to the domain of festivals, rites, etc., in P or in connection with the temple in Ezekiel. In contrast to Dtn usage, *šmr* never appears with *miṣwâ/miṣwôṯ* or *dāḇār/d^eḇārîm* in P or in Ezekiel. The word pair *ḥuqqôṯ* and *mišpāṭîm* is characteristic of H and probably represents a further development of the formula *ḥuqqîm* and *mišpāṭîm* in Deuteronomy.[93] These terms, as well as the other complements used with *šmr,* usually appear with the 1st person singular pronominal suffix, referring to Yahweh. Thus the words of Moses in Deuteronomy appear as the words of Yahweh in H.

The theology of P revolves around the twin poles of promise (Gen. 9; 17; Ex. 6) and commandment (Ex. 25–Nu. 19). In the *šmr* texts, God's promise is associated intimately with the commandment given to Abraham and his descendants (Gen. 17): the commandment (vv. 9-14) is based on the promise (vv. 3b-8). The covenant between Yahweh and Abraham involves on the part of God the realization of the promise ("this is my covenant with you," v. 4) and on the part of Abraham and his descendants obedience to God's commandments ("you shall keep my covenant," v. 9; cf. v. 10). This language accentuates the correspondence between what God does for Abraham and his people and what they are required to do for their God.[94] The commandments embody the obligations of Israel toward its God: *ḥuqqôṯ* and *mišpāṭîm* define the customs of Israel, which differ from those of other nations (cf. Lev. 18:3-5; 20:22-24) and originate in an explicit commandment of God.

93. R. Hentschke, *Satzung und Setzender. BWANT* 83 (1963), 91-95; C. Feucht, *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitsgesetz. ThArb* 20 (1964), 153-57; G. Braulik, *Bibl* 51 (1970) 61-62 = *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 33-34.

94. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 254-56.

The exhortations to keep *(šmr)* the commandments are often framed by the formula "I am Yahweh your God" or simply "I am Yahweh" (Lev. 18:4-5,26-30; 19:37; 20:22-24; cf. also Ezk. 20:18-21). These formulas go back to the Sinai event and in all probability constituted part of a sacral cultic code. Detached from their original setting, they serve as a literary means of emphasizing individual precepts or groups of precepts like those in Lev. 19.[95]

Among the precepts, Sabbath observance acquired particular importance in the exilic period. The formulas referring to the Sabbath bear a remarkable resemblance to those that refer to the commandments in general: plural noun with a 1st person singular suffix + *šmr.* This correspondence shows that the precept of Sabbath observance is conceived according to the same criterion as the other laws. The Sabbath precept has a fixed formulation *(ʾeṯ-šabbᵉṯōṯay tišmōrû)* in Ex. 31:13; Lev. 19:3,30; 26:2; Isa. 56:4. Other texts in Ex. 31 and Isa. 56 use a singular formulation (*šmr haššabbāṯ,* Ex. 31:14,16; Isa. 56:2,6; cf. also Dt. 5:12), which probably arose substantially later.[96] In Ex. 31:12-17, at the end of the cultic legislation (chs. 25–31), the emphasis lies on the Sabbath as a sign of the covenant. In Lev. 26:2 the precepts governing Sabbath observance and reverencing the sanctuary are combined. Sabbath observance and the building of the sanctuary have a common goal: the holiness of Israel (Ex. 29:43; 31:13).

This holiness is also the goal of the precept in Ezk. 20:20: "And you shall hallow my sabbaths." In vv. 19 and 21 the Sabbath is mentioned immediately after the word pair *ḥuqqôṯ* and *mišpāṭîm* and stands on a par with them. This language surely is an expression of a legislative process that concentrates the entire law in the Sabbath commandment.[97] In the conception of Ezekiel, fulfillment of the law is the fruit of a new heart and a new spirit that God will give his people (11:19-20a), thereby making Israel God's people and Yahweh the God of Israel (11:20b). In this view the commandments are the provisions of the covenant. Ultimately the theology of P shines through here: God's assistance through the gift of a new heart and a new spirit makes possible observance of the law.

f. *Psalms.* After Deuteronomy,[98] the Psalms are the book in which the word *šmr* appears most often. In texts where the verb is accompanied by terms for the domain of the law or covenant,[99] we hear more or less directly an echo of Deuteronomy and DtrH. Behind Ps. 78, 105, and 106, for example, we can make out the structure of Dtr historiography. In the sense of Deuteronomy, obedience *(šmr)* to the law is the appropriate response to God, who intervenes on behalf of his people (105:45; 106:3). Disobedience *(lōʾ šmr)* leads Israel to forget God's saving acts (78:10,56). Ps. 89 and 132 reflect the promise made by Nathan (2 S. 7): Yahweh keeps the promise of his steadfast love and his covenant with David (*lᵉʿôlām ʾešmôr*[*Q*]–*lô ḥasdî,* 89:29[28]), although he punishes those who do not keep his commandments (89:32[31]). In 132:11-12 the promise to David is made conditional on the obedience of David's successors. Also showing the

95. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 236-38.
96. J. Briend, *DBS,* X, 1159.
97. Negretti, 258.
98. See II.1 above.
99. See IV.2.a above.

influence of Deuteronomy and DtrH, Ps. 119 extols the glory of the law.[100] In each of the psalm's 22 strophes, eight terms for the law alternate continuously, together with the corresponding verbs. The most frequently used verb is *šmr;* it is also the only verb used with all eight terms: *šmr piqqûḏîm* (vv. 4,63,134,168), *šmr dāḇār* (vv. 9,17,57,101), *šmr tôrâ* (vv. 34,44,55,136), *šmr 'ēḏôṯ* (vv. 88,146,167,168), *šmr 'imrâ* (vv. 67,158), *šmr ḥōq* (vv. 5,8), *šmr miṣwâ* (v. 60), *šmr mišpāṭ* (v. 106). Thus *šmr,* used 22 times to express in rich variety the single fundamental idea of obedience and faithfulness to the law, is the key word of Ps. 119.

g. *Wisdom Literature.* One of the characteristic features of wisdom literature consists in the interweaving of ethical and religious values with existential and sapiential values. Several passages using the vb. *šmr* are to be understood within this coordinate system. In the view of the book of Proverbs, wisdom has a tutelary function ("understanding will guard [*tišmōr*] you," Prov. 2:11). When someone is imbued with wisdom, concomitant qualities come to the fore, so that the person walks in the way of the good and keeps to the paths of the just (*wᵉ'orḥôṯ ṣaddîqîm tišmōr,* 2:20). Wisdom demands a certain way of life that conforms to the law (28:4; 29:18). "One who keeps the commandments will keep his life" (*šōmēr miṣwâ šōmēr napšô,* 19:16). To attain this goal, strict discipline is necessary. Therefore the sage minds his heart (conscience), from which springs the crucial moral conduct of life (4:4,20-23). The sage guards his mouth and his tongue *(šōmēr pîw ûlᵉšônô)* in order to protect his life from trouble (*šmr miṣṣārôṯ napšô,* 21:23; cf. 13:3). In a word, to turn aside from evil is to preserve one's soul (16:17; cf. 22:5).

In all these passages the vb. *šmr* displays a semantic element of precautionary defense (cf. also 7:1-5). The interweaving of the existential with the ethical and sapiential is clear. Herein lies the innovative element of these wisdom texts. Eccl. 8:5 alludes to the traditional view of life: "Whoever obeys the commandment *(šmr miṣwâ)* will meet no harm." Job presents himself as a model of the wise and upright individual, who has kept the way of God *(darkô šāmartî)* with a zeal beyond the usual measure (Job 23:11-12).

h. *God and Angels as Guardians.* In some 50 passages God is the subject of *šmr;* 20 of these are in the Psalms and many others in various prayers (Hannah, 1 S. 2:9; Solomon, 1 K. 8:23ff.//2 Ch. 6:14ff.; Nehemiah and Ezra, Neh. 1:5; 9:32; etc.). These texts present a picture of God under two primary aspects. The first, more didactic in character, appears primarily in a series of creedal formulations avowing that Yahweh is the faithful God who keeps the covenant (*šōmēr habbᵉrîṯ,* Dt. 7:9; 1 K. 8:23; Dnl. 9:4; Neh. 1:5; 9:32; 2 Ch. 6:14; cf. Dt. 7:12; Ps. 89:29[28]), keeps faith (*šōmēr 'ᵉmeṯ,* Ps. 146:6), keeps his oath (*šmr 'eṯ-haššᵉḇu'â,* Dt. 7:8), and keeps steadfast love (*šmr-lô 'eṯ-haḥeseḏ,* 1 K. 3:6). The second, more existential aspect uses various forms (*'eṯ* or *lᵉ* with a person [Ps. 145:20; 146:9; 1 K. 8:24,25//2 Ch. 6:15,16]; *šmr* with a 1st person obj. suf. [Gen. 28:20; Josh. 24:17; Ps. 17:18; 140:5(4); 141:9]; or some other term such as *napšî* [Ps. 25:20; 86:2]) to declare that God preserves certain persons. Yahweh

100. A. Deissler, *Psalm 119 (118) und Seine Theologie. MTS* I/11 (1955), 270-72; W. Soll, *Psalm 119. CBQMS* 23 (1991).

watches over all who love him (145:20). He protects them from all evil (121:7). In a few rare instances, almost all in the book of Job, *šmr* can take on a certain negative and hostile sense (Job 10:14; 13:27; 14:16; 33:11; cf. Jer. 3:5). Except for these, God always appears as protector and defender of his own.[101] He is a "guardian" in the sense that he keeps his obligations, protecting and watching over all who are faithful to him. The motif of God as "guardian" is common, especially in the Pentateuch, the prophets, and the Psalms.

In Gen. 28:15 (cf. v. 20), "I am with you and will keep you *(ûšᵉmartîḵā)* wherever you go," God promises to accompany Jacob on his journeys. The experience of God's protective presence in danger is an outstanding element of personal piety, especially in the Psalms.[102] God is invoked as protector in both individual laments (Ps. 25:20; 86:2; 140:5; 141:9) and psalms of thanksgiving. The devout psalmist addresses a confident prayer to God: "Protect me *(šomrēnî),* O God, for I trust in you" (16:1); "Guard me *(šomrēnî)* as the apple of your eye" (17:8).

In Gen. 28:15 we can see the relationship between the "priestly oracle of salvation" and the individual laments in the Psalms.[103] Jacob affirms that God answered *(ʿnh)* him in the day of his distress (Gen. 35:3). Here Jacob is alluding to the salvation oracle in 28:13-15; at the same time, the vocabulary accords with that of the psalms of lament. The correspondence between *ʿnh* and *šmr* (Gen. 35:3; 28:15) appears again in Ps. 17:6,8; 86:1-2; 91:11,15. According to Ps. 91:11, God commands his angels to guard the faithful psalmist in all his ways. Angels are entrusted with the duty of guarding the way (*lišmōr ʾeṯ-dereḵ,* Gen. 3:24) or protecting the traveler on the way (*lišmōr badderek̲,* Ex. 23:20; *lišmōr bᵉḵōl-dereḵ,* Ps. 91:11).

In Nu. 6:24 divine protection is connected immediately with blessing: "May Yahweh bless you and keep you" *(yᵉḇārek̲ā yhwh wᵉyišmᵉreḵā).* The threefold repetition of the divine name in vv. 24-26 is intended to emphasize that it is God who bestows blessings. The use of *šmr* implies God's protection against evil, as in Ps. 121:7: "May Yahweh keep you from all evil" *(yhwh yišmorḵā mikkol-rāʿ).* Nu. 6:24, whose linguistic affinity to the Psalms is undeniable,[104] contains a single wish, intensified by the use of the two verbs *brk* and *šmr:* "May Yahweh bless you and keep you." An identical formula appears on the amulets from Ketef Hinnom.[105]

Jer. 31:10 draws on the conception of God as a guardian and shepherd: "He who scattered Israel will gather him, and will keep him as a shepherd his flock *(ûšᵉmarô kᵉrōʿeh ʿeḏrô).*" The use of the shepherd metaphor for Yahweh is very common in the Psalms (Ps. 23:1-3; 28:9; 80:1-2; etc.).[106] According to Carroll,[107] the Jeremiah text

101. Bertram, 245.

102. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 456.

103. J. Begrich, *ZAW* 52 (1934) 81-92.

104. G. B. Gray, *Numbers. ICC* (1905), 71-73.

105. H. N. Rösel, *BN* 35 (1986) 30-36; D. Conrad, *TUAT,* II, 929.

106. G.-J. Botterweck, "Hirt und Herde im AT und im alten Orient," *FS J. Kardinal Frings* (1960), 339-52; → XIII, 544-53.

107. R. P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant* (New York, 1981), 209-10.

may reflect the cultic hymns of the exilic period; these hymns use the metaphor of a flock protected by its shepherd to picture the future of Israel. In vv. 11-34 the notion of deliverance is associated with that of blessing in such a way that the image of God as guardian includes the aspects found in Nu. 6:24.

Among the many Psalms that invoke and praise God as guardian and protector, Ps. 121 stands out; in it the vb. *šmr* is repeated 6 times (3 times as a participle [vv. 3,4,5], 3 times in the imperfect [vv. 7(bis),8]) to stress the notion of God's presence. Yahweh keeps watch during the night (*'al-yānûm šōmᵉriḵā,* v. 3b); he protects (*yhwh šōmᵉreḵā,* v. 5a) and keeps from all evil (*yhwh yišmorḵā mikkol-rāʿ,* v. 7a). The psalmist voices trust in Yahweh, whose protective presence extends to the worshiper.

V. Niphal. The niphal of *šmr* is used primarily in the sense of "guard oneself, take care." Formally, the verb appears in calls for attention, in urgent appeals to realize the importance of doing or not doing a certain thing.

Of the 37 occurrences of the niphal, more than half are in the book of Deuteronomy or related texts. This is not surprising when one remembers that exhortations and warnings are very much at home in the parenetic style typical of the Dtn movement. One must not forget, however, that parenesis is often influenced by and derives its mode of expression from everyday language. For this reason, the niphal of *šmr* transcends parenetic usage and, like the qal, is employed in highly diverse contexts.

The most common form of the verb is the imperative (24 times), especially in the formula *hiššāmer lᵉḵā* (Gen. 24:6; 31:24,29; Ex. 10:28; 34:12; Dt. 4:9; 6:12; 8:11; 12:13,19,30; 15:9) or *hiššāmᵉrû-lāḵem* (Ex. 19:12; Dt. 4:23; 11:16).[108] In this construction the parenetic tone is clearly heard in the desire to touch the inmost soul of the person addressed. Such expressions as *wᵉnišmartem lᵉnap̄šōṯêḵem* (Dt. 4:15; Josh. 23:11)[109] or *bᵉnap̄šôṯêḵem* (Jer. 17:21) must be understood in the same sense. The reason for these urgent appeals is that fundamental personal values are at stake. In Dt. 4:9,23; 6:12; 8:11, for example, Moses warns the people not to forget Yahweh's theophany and the covenant at Horeb. In Jer. 17:21 the Israelites are exhorted scrupulously to avoid transgressing the Sabbath commandment (cf. Ex. 23:13).

Elsewhere the niphal of *šmr* is followed by *min* or *bᵉ,* specifying the person or action to be avoided. Amasa should have protected himself from the traitor's sword (2 S. 20:10). The man of God sends a message to the king, urging care while passing a certain place (2 K. 6:9). In Mal. 2:15,16, men are admonished to look to themselves and not be faithless to their wives. Jer. 9:3(4) urges the people to beware of their neighbors.

Finally, in some cases, such as Isa. 7:4 (cf. 1 S. 19:2), it is hard to assign a precise meaning to the vb. *šmr.* The context suggests that the Isaiah text urges Ahaz to be careful to remain calm and to be on guard against the enemy.

---

108. Achenbach, 154; G. Braulik, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik. AnBibl* 68 (1978), 88-89; Lohfink, 156.

109. D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 68.

VI. 1. *LXX.* As a rule the LXX uses *phylássein (phýlax, pylakḗ)* and the compounds *dia-* and *prophylássein (prophýlax, prophylakḗ)* to translate the vb. *šmr* and its derivatives. These Greek words basically cover the same semantic field as *šmr,* i.e., "watch, observe, fulfill, protect," etc.[110] Two other verbs used relatively often (10 times each) to translate *šmr* are *tēreín* and *proséchein,* together with their compounds *(syn-, paratēreín; antéchein).* The vb. *tēreín* translates both *šmr* and its par. *nṣr.* When *phylássein* and *(dia)tēreín* appear together, the former represents *šmr* and the latter *nṣr* (Dt. 33:9; Ps. 12:8[7]; Prov. 2:11).

Normally the vb. *proséchein* is used to render the niphal of *šmr,* especially in the formula *próseche seautǭ́,* which represents *hiššāmer lᵉḵā* (Gen. 24:6; Ex. 10:28; 23:21; 34:12; Dt. 4:9; 6:12; 8:11; 11:16; 12:13,19,30; 15:9; 24:8). Only once, in Ex. 34:11, does it represent the qal of *šmr.* Its use in the latter passage is not surprising when one notes that the formula *šᵉmor-lᵉḵā* in v. 11a has a reflexive sense remarkably similar to "warnings" that use *hiššāmer.*[111]

Other verbs occasionally used by the LXX to translate *šmr* include *poieín* (Ex. 12:17; 1 Ch. 29:19), *syneínai* and *ereídein* (Josh. 1:8; Prov. 3:26), and *akoúein* (Dt. 11:22; 19:9; 28:9; 31:12; Josh. 22:2; 2 Ch. 34:21). With regard to *akoúein,* one must remember that several passages in Deuteronomy closely associate *šmʿ* and *šmr,*[112] a combination that could also explain the use of *akoúein* to translate *šmr.*[113]

Finally, several passages must be noted in which the LXX clearly diverges from the MT. For example, in 2 S. 22:44 the LXX reads *tᵉśîmēnî* instead of MT *tišmᵉrēnî.* Since the MT of the par. Ps. 18:44(43) also reads *tᵉśîmēnî,* exegetes disagree as to which of the two forms is original. Dahood[114] translates and interprets Ps. 18:44 in the light of the MT of 2 S. 22:2 (*tišmᵉrēnî,* "protected me"), while McCarter[115] translates and interprets 2 S. 22:44 following LXX^L and in the light of Ps. 18:44(43) (*tᵉśîmēnî,* "and set me").

Mic. 6:16 is another special case. Instead of the unusual masoretic hithpael *wᵉyištammēr,* the LXX prefers *wattišmōr (ephýlaxas),* which agrees better with the usage of this verb in many other texts. The MT variant can be understood as a metathesis of *t/š;* many exegetes, beginning with Wellhausen, have so interpreted it.[116] In Ps. 37:28, finally, the LXX translates *nišmāḏû* instead of MT *nišmārû.* The majority of modern translators and comms. prefer the LXX reading on the grounds of parallelism.[117]

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The vb. *šmr* appears in many texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The most occurrences (19) are in the Damascus Document, followed by the Temple

---

110. Bertram, *TDNT,* IX, 236-39.
111. Ehrlich, *RHB,* I, 411.
112. See II.2 above.
113. But see A. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch* (Leipzig, 1907), 211.
114. M. Dahood, *Psalms I. AB* (1966), 103, 107.
115. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* (1984), 454, 461.
116. Wolff, *Micah,* 187.
117. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 403.

Scroll (10), the War Scroll (7), the Thanksgiving Hymns (7), and the Manual of Discipline (6).

Among the various expressions using *šmr,* the constructions with *bryt* stand out (1QS 5:2,9; 1QM 14:4,8; 18:7; 1QH 15:15; CD 19:1; 20:17; 1QSa 1:3). Even though *šmr bryt* is a typically biblical expression,[118] adopted by many Qumran texts, these texts nevertheless use it with a certain originality. In 1QM 14:4, instead of the biblical formula "keep the covenant and show steadfast love" (Dt. 7:9; Neh. 1:5; Dnl. 9:4; 2 Ch. 6:14), we find *hšmwr ḥsd lbrytw,* "show steadfast love to his covenant." The formula *šmr hbryt* itself is used of the Zadokite priests *(bny ṣdqw),* who are described as *hkwhnym šwmry hbryt* (1QS 5:2,9). There can be no doubt that this usage can claim originality (cf. 2 K. 12:10[9], which speaks of the priests as guardians of the threshold of the temple).

Also original when compared to the OT is the conception of these priests in other Qumran texts. Explicitly citing Ezk. 44:15, CD 4:1 says that they maintained the service of the temple *(šmrw 't mšmrt mqdšy).* Ezekiel contrasts the Zadokite Levitical priests, who alone are worthy to serve Yahweh, with the other Levitical priests, who had worshiped idols. By slightly modifying the Ezekiel text, however, the Damascus Document distinguishes three groups, in agreement with the conception or situation of its own time: the Zadokites, the other priestly families, and the Levites.[119]

Another biblical expression that appears relatively often, with some variations, in the Dead Sea Scrolls is *šmr mṣwwt* (1QpHab 5:5; 1QH 16:13,17 [reconstructed]; 1QSb 1:1; CD 2:18,21; 3:2,3; 19:2; 11QT 55:13). As in the biblical texts, the expression usually means keeping the commandments and being faithful to the will of God. The same sense is also conveyed by the expression *lšmr 'mnym* in 1QS 10:25, which is inspired by Isa. 26:2 (cf. also 1QS 8:3: *lšmr 'mwnh b'rṣ*), and explicit references to observing the Sabbath (CD 6:18; 10:14,16-17), which takes on great importance in the texts dealing with the community rule.

As in other biblical and extrabiblical literature,[120] the Dead Sea Scrolls use the participle of *šmr* to denote various functionaries. The War Scroll speaks of "the guardians of the weapons" (1QM 7:2), corresponding to the *custodes armorum* of the Roman army. They appear already in biblical texts (1 S. 17:22; 25:13; 30:24).

Among the expressions that are characteristic of the Dead Sea Scrolls but have no equivalent in biblical texts, we may single out one from the Community Rule. In a series of personal decisions connected with entrance into the community, the aspirants promise "not to hold fast to Belial" (the prince of demons) within their hearts (*wbly'l lw' 'šmwr blbby,* 1QS 10:21).

Of the 10 passages in the Temple Scroll, finally, the majority correspond to stipulations in the great legal codes of the Pentateuch, especially Deuteronomy. 11QT 53:9-14 combines Dt. 12:26ff. and 23:22ff. (cf. esp. l. 13 and Dt. 23:24). Similarly, the formula

118. See IV.2 above.

119. E. Cothenet, *Les textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés,* II (Paris, 1963), 159-60, no. 36.

120. See IV.1-2 above.

w't mṣwwty yšmwr in 11QT 59:16 is based on Lev. 26:3-4 and Dt. 28:1. On account of its great importance for textual criticism, the formula found in 11QT 54:6 must be singled out: *'nwky mṣwkh ('wtmh) hywm tšmwr l'śwt.* This formula goes back to Dnl. 13:1. But while the MT reads *tšmrw,* 11QT reads *tšmwr,* with LXX, Syr., and Vg.

García López

שֶׁמֶשׁ *šemeš*

I. The Word: 1. Original Form; 2. Gender. II. Deity: 1. Names; 2. Sun Chariot; 3. Cult. III. Heavenly Body: 1. East and West; 2. Time of Day; 3. Daylight.

šemeš. C. Bonnet, "Le dieu solaire Shamash dans le monde phénico-punique," *SEL* 6 (1989) 97-115; A. Caquot, "La divinité solaire ougaritique," *Syr* 36 (1959) 90-101; J. H. Charlesworth, "Les Odes de Salomon et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte," *RB* 77 (1970) 522-49, esp. 538-40; F. Cumont, "La théologie solaire du paganisme romain," *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 12/2 (1913) 447-79; M. Dothan, *Hammath Tiberias* (Jerusalem, 1983), esp. 39-43; J. Dus, "Gibeon — eine Kultstätte des Šmš und die Stadt des benjaminitischen Schicksals," *VT* 10 (1960) 353-74; H. van Dyke Parunak, "Was Solomon's Temple Aligned to the Sun?" *PEQ* 110 (1978) 29-33; J. D. Eisenstein, "Sun," in *JE,* XI (1906), 589-91; R. Eisler, "Jahves Hochzeit mit der Sonne," *Orientalische Studien. FS F. Hommel,* II. *MVÄG,* 22 (1917), 21-70; F. M. Fales, "A Cuneiform Correspondence to Alphabetic ש in West Semitic Names of the I Millennium B.C.," *Or* 47 (1978) 91-98; T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (Garden City, [2]1961), esp. 66-67; G. H. Halsberghe, *The Cult of Sol Invictus. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* (Leiden, 1972); T. Hartmann, "שֶׁמֶשׁ *šemeš* sun," *TLOT,* III, 1384-92; J. F. Healey, "The Sun Deity and the Underworld in Mesopotamia and Ugarit," in B. Alster, ed., *Death in Mesopotamia* (Copenhagen, 1980), 239-42; F. J. Hollis, *The Archaeology of Herod's Temple* (London, 1934), esp. 125, 132-33; idem, "The Sun-Cult and the Temple at Jerusalem," in S. H. Hooke, ed., *Myth and Ritual* (Oxford, 1933), 87-110; E. Lipiński, "Le culte du Soleil chez les Sémites occidentaux du I[er] millenaire av. J.-C.," *OLP* 22 (1991) 57-72; J. Maier, "Die Sonne im religiösen Denken des antiken Judentums," *ANRW,* II/19.1 (1979), 346-412; P. Maser, "Sonne und Mond," *Kairos* 25 (1983) 41-67; H. G. May, "The Departure of the Glory of Yahweh," *JBL* 56 (1937) 309-21; idem, "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *ZAW* 55 (1937) 269-81; J. W. McKay, "Further Light on the Horses and Chariot of the Sun in the Jerusalem Temple (2 Ki 23:11)," *PEQ* 105 (1973) 167-69; idem, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians (732-609 B.C.). SBT* 2/26 (1973); J. Morgenstern, "The Book of the Covenant," *HUCA* 5 (1928) 1-151, esp. 45-67; idem, "The Cultic Setting of the 'Enthronement Psalms,'" *HUCA* 35 (1964) 1-42; idem, "The Gates of Righteousness," *HUCA* 6 (1929) 1-37, esp. 34-37; idem, "The King-God Among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," *VT* 10 (1960) 138-97, esp. 159-61, 179, 182-89; M. P. Nilsson, "Sonnenkalender und Sonnenreligion," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 30 (1933) 141-73; W. O. E. Oesterley, "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," in Hooke, *Myth and Ritual,* 111-46, esp. 115-16, 133-35; G. Pettinato, "Is 2,7 e il culto del sole in Giuda nel secolo VIII av.Cr.," *OrAnt* 4 (1965) 1-30; A. Rubens, "Son," *EncJud,* XV, 516-18; H. Seyrig, "Le culte du Soleil en Syrie à l'époque romaine," *Syr* 48 (1971) 337-73; M. Smith, "Helios in Palestine," *ErIsr* 16 (1982) 199*-214*; N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival*

I. The Word.

1. *Original Form.* The earliest evidence of "Sun" as a theonym in West Semitic is found in the Ebla texts, where this word is represented by the ideogram **ᵈ**UTU. Its pronunciation is so far unknown, unless the name of the Sun-deity appears in proper names as *śi-piš* or *sé-peš*. However, these signs are read as ZI.KIR by most Assyriologists, who decline to assign the phonetic value *peš* to the KIR sign because it is not attested in Mesopotamia until 2000 B.C.E. The Eblaite writing of this theonym would agree to some extent with Ugaritic, where the sun goddess is called *špš* (Akk. *ša-ap-šu*),[1] but Eblaite would provide a different vocalization and still distinguish between the two sibilants of the word. There is no doubt that the Old South Arabian name of the sun, s_2ms_1 *(śmš)*, from which Classical Arab. *šams* derives *(ś > š; š > s)*, preserves the ancient form of the name. It reappears (exceptionally) in Aramaic, where *smš'*[2] can derive only from *śmš*. Despite their antiquity, the occurrences of *śpš > špš* at Ebla (?) and Ugarit by no means prove that the form with *p* is primary. They are concentrated in a relatively narrow range of Semitic dialects, where the phonetic shift *m > mp > p* is easily conceivable in the light of similar phenomena in Greek transcriptions *(Sampsōn* and *Sampsai*[*o*]*s):*[3] in contact with the sibilant *š* in *śamšu,* the *m* gives rise to an intrusive stop *p* (**śampšu*); then the etymological nasal *m* is elided *(śapšu).*

2. *Gender.* The gender of the subst. *śmš* was originally feminine, as its usage in Ugaritic and Old South Arabian shows. The Palestinian correspondence from Tell el-Amarna treats *šmš* as feminine,[4] as do many OT texts (Gen. 15:17; Ex. 22:2[Eng. 3]; Dt. 24:15; Jgs. 19:14; 2 S. 2:24; 12:11; 2 K. 3:22; Isa. 38:8; Mic. 3:6; Nah. 3:17; Mal. 3:20[4:2]; Ps. 104:22; Cant. 1:6; Eccl. 12:2; Sir. 42:16; 50:7; but cf. the masc. examples in Gen. 19:23; Jgs. 5:31; Josh. 10:12; Ps. 104:19[5]), probably Deir ʿAlla inscription I, 6(8) (*š*[*m*]*š*), and the Aramaic literature of Palestine.[6]

In Mesopotamia, where Sumerian influence imposed on the sun of the Semites the masculine gender of Utu, the sun god of Sumer, Shamash was considered a masculine figure, although in the early period we find a trace of a different conception in the Old Akk. *um-mi-*ᵈUTU, "Shamash is my mother."[7] This name is also found among the Amorites of the 18th century B.C.E. as a personal name for women;[8] its

(London, 1947), esp. 90-93; H. P. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des AT. OBO* 66 (1985); S. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert," in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin, eds., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. ScrHier* 4 (1958) 162-99 = *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem, 1989), 147-85; J. Tubach, *Im Schatten des Sonnengottes* (Wiesbaden, 1986).

1. *Ugaritica,* V, 249 (no. 138).
2. *BMAP* 5.9.
3. J. Quaegebeur, *Le dieu égyptien Shaï* (Louvain, 1975), 231.
4. EA 323:22-23.
5. See also (without explanation) Michel, 78.
6. J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976), 282.
7. *MAD,* I, 225.
8. *ARM,* XVI/1, 209.

ideographic equivalent is probably attested since the pre-Sargonic era: UTU.AMA.MU = *šamaš-ummī*.[9]

In Syro-Phoenicia and Palestine the sun occasionally acquired the masculine gender though Assyro-Babylonian influence. Aramaic and Hebrew texts from Qumran (11QT 20:13; 45:9; 50:15; 51:3,5), however, still use *šmš* as a feminine noun, and in the Hebrew of the Mishnah we find the fem. pl. *šᵉmāšôṯ*.

II. Deity. All Semites considered the sun and moon to be endowed with divine qualities, although sun worship did not achieve any particular importance among the Phoenicians and Arameans of the Iron Age. Sun and moon often appear together in the OT: Gen. 37:9; Dt. 4:19; 17:3; Josh. 10:12-13; 2 K. 23:5; Isa. 13:10; 60:19-20; Jer. 8:2; 31:35; Ezk. 32:7; Joel 2:10; 3:4(2:31); 4:15(3:15); Hab. 3:11; Ps. 72:5; 89:37-38(36-37); 104:19; 121:6; 136:8-9; 148:3; Eccl. 12:2. The linkage of the two words as a stereotyped dyad does not in itself imply any religious significance.

1. *Names.* The early Canaanite worship of the sun finds an echo in Palestinian toponyms of the OT period. The names *bêṯ šemeš* (Josh. 15:10; 21:16; etc.), *ʿên šemeš* (Josh. 15:7; 18:17), and *ʿîr šemeš* (Josh. 19:41) recall the existence of sanctuaries dedicated to the sun. The *bêṯ šemeš* of Jer. 43:13, however, refers to the Egyptian sun temple at Heliopolis. Unlike these toponyms, Hebrew anthroponyms preserve almost no trace of the sun cult; the name Samson can simply mean "little sun," as the diminutive suf. *-ôn/-ān* suggests. The Aramaic anthroponym *šimšay* (Ezr. 4:8-9,17,23) is probably identical with *šāšay* (Ezr. 10:40), since the Neo-Assyrian theophorous element *šamaš* could be represented in Aramaic by *ss*, as l. 7 of the Tell Fekheriye inscription shows.

2. *Sun Chariot.* The chariot and horses of fire that bore Elijah into heaven (2 K. 2:11-12; cf. 6:17; 13:14; Sir. 48:9) recalls the chariots of the sun in 2 K. 23:11. This singular mention of the sun chariots in the Jerusalem temple may recall the episode in the Elijah legend and the vision of the "chariot of Yahweh" in Ezk. 1. This evidence indicates that the ancient Israelites were familiar with the image of the divine charioteer who drives the quadriga of the sun through the heavens. Much later, 1 Ch. 28:18 speaks of the "model for the throne chariot" in the Jerusalem temple. The liturgy for the Sabbath sacrifice in 4Q403 also mentions "the form of the throne chariot." Finally, Sir. 49:8 speaks of "the figures above the throne chariot."

Some rabbinic texts reflect the notion of a sun chariot in early Jewish tradition. Ch. 6 of *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer,* which must be dated in the first half of the 8th century C.E., cites Ps. 19:6(5) and describes the sun riding in its chariot: "And the sun *(wᵉḥammâ)* riding in its chariot rises up, crowned like a young bridegroom." Here the sun is called *ḥammâ,* as in Isa. 24:23; 30:26; Job 30:28; Cant. 6:10; and certain magical texts.[10] This

---

9. *MAD,* III, 42.

10. E.g., J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* (Jerusalem, 1985), 56-57, 60 (amulet 4:20).

noun is of course feminine. In a commentary on Cant. 3:10, Nu. Rab. 12:4 also describes the sun *(haššemeš)* as riding in its chariot to illuminate the universe. When one considers the biblical precursors of this notion, the theory of Greek or Roman influences (ideas associated with Helios) appears unnecessary, though possible (cf. the Byzantine period mosaics at Beth Alpha,[11] Naaran,[12] and Hammath-Tiberias,[13] where the central figure of Helios in his chariot is surrounded by the signs of the zodiac).

The image of a divine chariot probably also lies behind the Aramaic triad from Zinjirli (8th century B.C.E.); it consists of El, his charioteer and tutelary deity of the dynasty *(Rkb ʾl),* and Shamash. They could be joined by Hadad, the chief god of the Arameans, and Arqu-Rashap, a fusion of the North Arabian god *rḍy/w* and the North Syrian god *ršp.*[14] The notion of a solar chariot is undoubtedly the product of a widespread belief among the peoples of antiquity, who conceived the solar disk on its daily course from east to west as a wheel circling in the firmament. This notion is attested once in Judea by the image of a deity seated on a winged wheel, found on a famous coin dating from the Persian period.[15] There is also a text in the Dead Sea Scrolls (CD 10:15) that mentions *glgl hšmš,* "the sun's wheel," called *galgal ḥammâ* in rabbinic literature (Bab. *Yoma* 20b).

3. *Cult.* Worship of the sun, moon, or stars is condemned in Dt. 17:3 (cf. 11QT 55:18). In Job 31:16-17 Job declares that he has never ventured to pay homage to the sun or moon; he avoids using the word *šemeš,* using instead *ʾôr,* "luminary." The danger presented by the solar cult was not imaginary, as 2 K. 23:5,11 and Ezk. 8:16 show. To counter this danger, various OT texts stress the creatureliness of the sun. Without using the word *šemeš,* Gen. 1:14-18 emphasizes that God created the sun (cf. Jer. 31:35; Ps. 74:16; 104:19; 136:8; 148:3-6 — all with *šemeš*). Whatever may have been the original context of the ancient adjuration in Josh. 10:12b, its present setting in vv. 12-14 (cf. Sir. 46:4) presupposes at least indirectly the dependence of the sun and moon on Yahweh. An analogous situation obtains in Job 9:7 and Isa. 38:7-8 (cf. 2 K. 20:9-11; Sir. 48:23), where the course of the sun is held back at the command of a man of God.

A fragment of a hymn to the sun has been incorporated into Ps. 19:5c-7 (corrupt text). The author of 84:12(11) does not hesitate to call Yahweh *šemeš ûmāḡēn,* "sun and shield," an antithetical image expressing both the radiance of light from the sun and protection from its oppressive heat. The phrase is often translated "battlement and shield," on the argument that *šemeš* in 84:12(11) has the same meaning as the plural in Isa. 54:12 and 4Q164 1 1. But this translation is controversial, and Yahweh's coming is already described as the rising of the sun in Dt. 33:2 and Hab. 3:3-4. The glory of Yahweh also comes from the east in Isa. 59:19; Ezk. 43:2,4; 44:1-2; and Isa. 60:19 declares that God's light will replace that of the sun when Jerusalem is restored.

---

11. E. L. Sukenik, *The Ancient Synagogue of Beth Alpha* (Jerusalem, 1932), pl. X.
12. L. H. Vincent, *RB* 68 (1961), pl. XXI.
13. Dothan, pls. 13 and 29.
14. *KAI* 214.2,3,11,18; 215.22.
15. *ANEP,* no. 226.

One may wonder whether mythological connotations lie hidden behind these images and whether the coming of the glory of the God of Israel through the east gate of the temple implies features of an actual solar cult or was simply suggested by the fact that the radiance of the rising sun could penetrate into the sanctuary at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes.

The appearance of solar symbolism in synagogal iconography ultimately signals the problem of a certain solar syncretism in Judaism, the origins of which probably go back to the OT period.[16] Morgenstern even claims that Yahweh was worshiped in Jerusalem as a sun god. He assumes that until the time of David, the cult of Yahweh was so extensively agrarian that Yahweh was understood as a nature god who died and rose with the rhythm of the seasons. The construction of Solomon's temple on the model of the temple of Melkart at Tyre then led to the transformation of Yahweh into a sun god. Indeed, according to the Talmud,[17] the temple's orientation permitted the rays of the rising sun to penetrate into the Most Holy Place at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. According to Morgenstern, the effort to bring about this phenomenon through the orientation of the temple attests to Solomon's conception of his God as a solar deity.

In both the agrarian and the solar cult, Morgenstern believes, the Mount of Olives played a central role. Here, supposedly, was the entrance to the netherworld; on its peak stood a sanctuary of the god of the netherworld. Therefore it marked the site where the dead or vanished god arose. In Morgenstern's eyes, it did not matter whether this god was a local form of Tammuz, the defied representative of the annual harvest, or the new solar deity of Solomon. In both cults the Mount of Olives was the site of the resurrected deity, who would festively enter his sanctuary to sit on his royal throne. At some time before or after the building of the temple, the king came to personify in the cultic ceremonies the agrarian deity who dies and rises again or the solar deity who vanishes in the west and is reborn in the east.

In the solar cult of both the Solomonic temple and the Second Temple — destroyed, Morgenstern claims, at the time of a hypothetical national catastrophe ca. 485 B.C.E. — it was the first rays of the rising sun *(kᵉḇôḏ yhwh)* that announced the beginning of the new year and the resurrection of Yahweh, the sun god; at the same time they marked his triumphal entrance into the sanctuary through its east gate (the "gate of righteousness"), facing the Mount of Olives. The rays of the sun in front of the *dᵉḇîr* of the temple vividly symbolized the "joyful entry" of Yahweh into his sanctuary.

From the construction of the temple under Solomon until the supposed reform of the cult under Asa ca. 899 B.C.E., a seat of gold would have served as the throne of the king, who personified Yahweh and took his place in the *dᵉḇîr.* Morgenstern would have referred here to the "great throne of Shamash" in the Mari texts[18] or to the "throne of the sun" in the temple at Hierapolis.[19] Later, until 485 B.C.E., the ancient ark of the cove-

---

16. See Hollis, Oesterley, May, Gaster, and more recently Stähli, who cites the symbol of the "winged sun disk" on the handles of pottery jars from Judah, dating from the monarchy.

17. Jer. *'Erub.* 5:22c.

18. *Studia Mariana* 56/57, nos. 16-17.

19. Lucian, *De Dea Syria* 34.

nant or a copy of it, he believes, took the place of Yahweh's throne. In his opinion, this throne undoubtedly played an important role during the central liturgies of the eight-day festival. The high point of the festivities would have consisted in a procession from the Mount of Olives to the temple, where the king took his seat on the divine throne of Yahweh and was worshiped as a sun god. According to Morgenstern, these solemnities are the setting of the enthronement psalms.

These extreme views have hardly any adherents today, but the eastward orientation of the Jerusalem temple still resists interpretation. Clearly the priests attached great importance to questions concerning the luni-solar calendar, as witness the Aramaic fragments of the "Astronomical Handbook" of Enoch found at Qumran (4QEnastr = 4Q208-211). These fragments demonstrate that 1 En. 72–82 are a section of a text defending the solar calendar of 364 days and attempting to synchronize it with the lunar year. This same calendar is used by the book of Jubilees and governs the life of the Qumran community, which understands itself as having been planted "with the plumb line of the sun" *('l mšqlt hšmš).* The Dead Sea Scrolls, especially the Temple Scroll, 4QMMT (= 4Q394-399), and the postscript to 11QPs^a^ (11QPs^a^ 27:6) refer to it continually. The morning and evening prayers for each day of the month are contained in 4QpapPrQuot (4Q503); the formulary beginning the morning office reads: *bṣ't hšmš lh'yr 'lh'rṣ,* "when the sun rises to illuminate the earth" (10:1; cf. similarly 4Q33-36 11:1, 10). This is probably the morning prayer to which Josephus alludes: "They worship the deity in an extraordinary fashion: before the sun rises, they speak no profane word, but turning toward the sun recite certain traditional prayers, as though making supplication for its rising."[20] They did not worship the sun, but celebrated Yahweh in a hymn to the Creator, "who divides the light from the darkness and establishes the dawn *(šḥr)* through the wisdom of his heart" (11QPs^a^ 26:9-15, 11-12). The author of 1QH 7:25 also addresses God with the words "You are for me an eternal light *(limᵉ'ôr 'ôlām),*" a formula that echoes the Odes of Solomon, whose author calls the Lord "my sun" (15:1-2) and says that he is "like a sun upon the earth" (11:13).

If it is true that the first members of the Qumran community were Sadducees who rejected any compromise with the Hasmonean high priests, then their practices and language reflect traditional notions from the period of the Second Temple and possibly the temple of Solomon. We may therefore assume that the sun *(šemeš)* was indeed a symbol for Yahweh. Nor is it surprising that the sun is named explicitly in parallel with the glory of Yahweh in Sir. 42:16: "The rising sun sheds its light everywhere, the glory of Yahweh upon all his works" *(šmš zwrḥt 'l kl nglth wkbwd yyy 'l kl m'śyw).* This idea reappears in 43:2-5, although here the sun is qualified as God's creation. Another passage uses the sun as a simile to describe the splendor of the high priest Simon II (ca. 220-195 B.C.E.): during ceremonies in the temple, he appeared "like the sun shining on the royal palace" (50:7: *kšmš mśqrt 'l hykl hmlk*).

A similar comparison is applied to David in 11QPs^a^ 27:2: "And David, son of Jesse, was wise, and a light like the light of the sun *(w'wr k'wr hšmš).*" The author was proba-

20. *B.J.* 2.128.

bly inspired by 2 S. 23:4, but the simile was a commonplace. According to 1 En. 106:5, the eyes of Noah at his birth were "like the rays of the sun"; according to 1Q19 fr. 3 5, they lit up "the rooms of the house like the rays of the sun *(kḥdwdy hšmš)*." According to the Book of the Mysteries (1Q27 1 1:6-7), which probably describes the last judgment, "righteousness appears like the sun, the foundation of the universe" *(hṣdq yglh kšmš tkwn tbl)*. This simile points to the notion of the sun and moon as eternal, changeless elements of the cosmic order, marking its cyclical phases. This idea is already formulated in Ps. 89:37-38(36-37) and very probably in Ps. 72:5,17 (cf. LXX); it is taken up again in Ps. 148:3-6 and Jer. 31:35-36.

In the fragmentary context of a commentary on Isa. 54:11-12, we find the simile "like the sun in all its light" (4QpIsa**d** [4Q164] 1:6). The importance of the sun is also emphasized by Philo of Alexandria,[21] but Wis. 7:29-30 stresses the superiority of wisdom to the sun, since wisdom is identical with the divine law.

One must admit that popular thought associated the sun with a number of mythological ideas, even if these did not always take the concrete form of the sun chariot. To some extent the sun, moon, and stars are personified in Joseph's dream (Gen. 37:9); and the Jewish Aramaic magical texts of the talmudic era[22] assign an active role to the sun, called *šamêš (šmys, š'myš)*, as in the Babylonian Talmud, whereas the daystar is called *šimšā' (šymš')*.[23] In the Palestinian Talmud the "sun of God" (*šamši-'ēl* [*šmšy'l*]) appears as the fifteenth of the fallen angels; it was his task to instruct humankind in "the signs of the sun," i.e., astrology. He appears also in the earliest section (first half of the 2d century B.C.E.) of 1 Enoch (7:7; 8:3). He is named *samsape'el* or *simsipi'el* in the Ethiopic text and *Samiēl* or *Semiēl* in the Greek fragments. In Sib. Or. 2:215 (3d century C.E.), Samiel plays a role in the last judgment. The sun appears also in Sib. Or. 13:150-151, which contains a prophecy after the event concerning what took place before the death of Gallienus (253-260 C.E.). Between the death of Aemilianus in 253 and the accessions of Valerian and Gallienus in the same year, the text speaks of "a priest sent by the sun *(hēliópemptos)*" who will withstand the Persians, while "the city of the sun *(hēlíou pólis)* will pray for it." Although the author was a Jew or a Jewish Christian, "sun" here refers to the sun god of Emesa in Syria.

III. Heavenly Body.

1. *East and West.* The OT generally uses *šemeš* to denote the time of day or one of the two cardinal points east and west. For example, *mimmizraḥ (haš)šemeš* means "in the region of the rising sun," i.e., "in the east" (Nu. 21:11; Jgs. 11:18; 20:43; 21:19; Isa. 41:25; 45:6; 59:19; Mal. 1:11; Ps. 50:1; 113:3); *mizrᵉḥâ (haš)šemeš* (Dt. 4:41; Josh. 12:1) and *mizraḥ (haš)šemeš* (Dt. 4:47; Josh. 1:15; 13:14; 19:12,27,34; 2 K. 10:33) clearly mean the same thing or "toward the east." The word *mizraḥ* can also be used without *(haš)šemeš* in the sense of "east."

21. *De opificio mundi; Somn.* 1.13.76ff.

22. C. D. Isbell, *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls. SBLDS* 17 (1975), nos. 38.2; 62.2; Naveh and Shaked, 200-203, 214 (bowl 13:11,21).

23. Naveh and Shaked, 168-69, 172 (bowl 7:7).

By contrast, the word *ma'ᵃrāḇ,* denoting the west, literally the "entry" of the sun beneath the earth, always appears without *šemeš.* Instead, Aramaic consistently uses *m'rb šmš,*[24] except in Dnl. 6:15(14), where we find *me'ālê šimšā'.* However, Hebrew uses *šemeš* in the synonymous expression *mᵉḇô' (haš)šemeš* (Dt. 11:30; Josh. 1:4; 23:4; Zec. 8:7; Mal. 1:11; Ps. 50:1; 104:19; 113:3).

2. *Time of Day.* The expression *zāraḥ* or *zārᵉḥâ (haš)šemeš,* literally "the sun shines forth" or "the sun rises," indicates the beginning of the day (Gen. 32:32[31]; Ex. 22:2[3]; Jgs. 9:33; 2 S. 23:4; 2 K. 3:22; Jon. 4:8; Nah. 3:17; Mal. 3:20[4:2]; Ps. 104:22; Eccl. 1:5). The expression *yāṣā' (haš)šemeš,* "the sun goes forth," is used with the same meaning (Gen. 19:23; Jgs. 5:31; Isa. 13:10; 4Q503 10 1; cf. Ps. 75:7[6]). Sunset is denoted by the expression *bā'* or *bā'â (haš)šemeš,* which means literally "the sun goes in" (Gen. 15:12,17; 28:11; Ex. 17:12; 22:25[26]; Lev. 22:7; Dt. 16:6; 23:12[11]; 24:13,15; Josh. 8:29; 10:27; Jgs. 19:14; 2 S. 2:24; 3:35; 1 K. 22:36; Isa. 60:20; Jer. 15:9; Mic. 3:6; Am. 8:9; Eccl. 1:5; 2 Ch. 18:34; 1QM 18:5; 11QT 20:13; 45:9; 50:4,15; 51:3,5). To express the notion of midday, Hebrew can use the expression *ḥom haššemeš,* "the heat of the sun" (1 S. 11:9; Neh 7:3).

The time of sunrise or sunset can be legally significant. The killing of a thief during the night does not entail the same consequences as the same act committed during the day (Ex. 22:2[3]); a cloak taken in pawn must be restored before the nightfall (Ex. 22:25[26]; Dt. 24:13); an employer is obligated to pay a day laborer's wages before sunset (Dt. 24:15). Sunset is also significant in the ritual sphere: for the purification of a priest (Lev. 22:7) or warrior (Dt. 23:12[11]), for the sacrifice of the paschal lamb (Dt. 16:6), for the burial of the dead (Josh. 8:29; 10:27), and for mourning (2 S. 3:35).

The importance of sunset increases over time, so that the Dead Sea Scrolls insist emphatically that work be stopped on the eve of the Sabbath when the sun's disk is the distance of its diameter above the horizon (CD 10:14-17). Sacrificial flesh must be consumed before sunset (11QT 20:12-13), and people must purify themselves until sunset before entering the sanctuary (11QT 45:9-10). Purification after contact with a human corpse or the dead body of an animal must take place before sunset (11QT 50:3-4,15-16; 51:2-5). Finally, so that the enemy may be totally destroyed, the prayer for the lengthening of the day of battle must be recited until sunset (1QM 18:5).

3. *Daylight.* Among the common expressions meaning "on earth" one finds the phrase *taḥaṯ haššemeš,* "under the sun," which plays the role of a leitmotif in Ecclesiastes (1:3,9,14; 2:11,17-20,22; 3:16; 4:1,3,7,15; 5:12,17[13,18]; 6:1,12; 8:9,15[bis], 17; 9:3,6,9[bis],11,13; 10:5). In Phoenician, *tḥt šmš* denotes the state of the living in contrast to that of the dead,[25] just like *'l pn šmš,* "in the sight of the sun."[26] "See the sun" means "be alive" (Eccl. 7:11). A stillborn child is described as "never having seen the sun" (Ps. 58:9[8]; Eccl. 6:5). Finally, "seeing the sun" is a delight to the eyes (Eccl.

24. *DISO,* 162.
25. *KAI* 13.17-18; 14.12.
26. *BAr,* 1941/42, 388, l. 5.

11:7); this pleasure can itself be a temptation to sun worship (Dt. 4:19). The darkening of the sun, by contrast, is an ill omen, attesting to God's anger (Isa. 13:10; Ezk. 32:7; Joel 2:10; 3:4; 4:15[3:15]; Hab. 4:11; Eccl. 12:2; cf. Jer. 15:9; Mt. 27:45; Mk. 15:33; Lk. 23:44). Actions performed "under the eyes of the sun" (2 S. 12:11) or "in the sight of the sun" (Nu. 25:4; 2 S. 12:12), i.e., in public, take on special importance.

It was considered a terrible disgrace for the mortal remains of human beings to remain unburied, exposed to the burning light of the sun (Jer. 8:2; cf. 25:33).

The sun "scorches" (Cant. 1:6); therefore its heat can be considered undesirable and dangerous. The sun can "smite" (Isa. 49:10; Jon. 4:8; Ps. 121:6), an allusion to sunstroke.

It is interesting that the beneficent role of the sun in the growth of vegetation is mentioned only rarely (Dt. 33:14; Job 8:16; cf. 1QH 8:21-22).

Lipiński

שֵׁן *šēn*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. 1. Value; 2. Threat; 3. Proverbs; 4. Figurative Usage; 5. Ivory; 6. Extended Sense. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The noun *šēn* means "tooth" (of a human being or animal) and "ivory" (as the tooth or tusk of an elephant); figuratively it can mean "spike, peak." It is a Common Semitic primary noun:[1] Akk. *šinnu(m),* no verb;[2] Ugar. *šn,*[3] sometimes meaning "ivory,"[4] vb. *šnn,* "grind one's teeth";[5] Biblical Aram. *šēn;* Jewish Aram. *šinna;*[6] Syr. *šēnaʾ;*[7] Mand. *šina;*[8] Arab. *sinn;*[9] Eth. *šen.*[10] The noun is unrelated to the vb. *šnn.*[11] It occurs 55 times in the OT.[12] In Cant. 7:10(Eng. 9), despite the well-

---

šēn. A. Cohen, "*šēn,*" *BethM* 23 (1977/78) 237-38; E. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien* (Paris, 1923), esp. 87-88; S. Schroer, "Elfenbein," *NBL,* I, 513-14; H. Weippert, "Elfenbein," *BRL²,* 67-72; J. A. Wharton, "Tooth," *IDB,* IV, 672.

1. *HAL,* II, 1593; *BLe,* §61b′.
2. *AHw,* III, 1243.
3. *WUS,* no. 2647.
4. *KTU* 1.19, IV, 27 (B. Margalit, *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT. BZAW* 182 [1989], 164, 447); 1.108, 5 (ibid., 438); 2.17, 5 (M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 14 [1982] 87).
5. *UT,* no. 2453.
6. *ChW,* 498.
7. *LexSyr,* 789.
8. *MdD,* 462.
9. Wehr, 433.
10. *LexLingAeth,* 371.
11. Contra *KBL²,* 995, 998; *GesB,* 850.
12. Even-Shoshan, 1186.

attested variant *śᵉpāṯay wᵉšinnāy,*[13] MT *śipṯê yᵉšēnîm,* "lips of sleepers," should be retained.[14] The noun also occurs 3 times in Daniel (7:5,7,19) and once in Sirach (40:15).

II. 1. *Value.* Since the very earliest times, the teeth have been considered a significant element of human appearance, as illustrated by the saying about Judah in the Blessing of Jacob: "His eyes are darker than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk" (Gen. 49:12). Further typical examples of the poetic use of the word (found also elsewhere in the ancient Near East) appear in the Song of Songs: "Your teeth are like a flock of ewes coming up from the washing" (Cant. 6:6; 4:2; cf. 7:10[9]; Job 19:20).

The high value placed on teeth is illustrated also by their appearance in ancient Near Eastern law codes in connection with the *lex talionis:* "If any harm follows, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Ex. 21:23-24; likewise Lev. 24:20; Dt. 19:21).[15] The law continues: "And if the owner knocks out a tooth of a male or female slave, the slave shall be let go" (Ex. 21:27). This astonishing provision demonstrates the high value placed on teeth.

The Code of Hammurabi also mentions teeth in conjunction with the *ius talionis:* "If a free man knocks out the teeth of another free man, his equal, then his own teeth shall be knocked out" (§208). But if he knocks out the teeth of a man who is a dependent, he merely pays one-third of a silver mina.[16] The Code of Eshnunna, about a century earlier than the Code of Hammurabi, decrees: "If a man bites the nose of another man and severs it, he shall pay one mina of silver, for an eye one mina, for a tooth a half mina, for an ear a half mina" (§42). While both the Code of Hammurabi and the OT laws apply the principle of the *ius talionis* in minor cases like the loss of a tooth, the earlier Code of Eshnunna and also the Hittite laws require indemnification instead of retribution. Nevertheless, the OT law requiring the release of a slave as compensation for knocking out his tooth is noteworthy (Ex. 21:27).[17]

2. *Threat.* Teeth often typify a dangerous beast of prey or a feared enemy. In the Song of Moses, the nation that has rejected its God is threatened with hunger, plague, pestilence, and "the teeth of beasts . . . with venom of things crawling in the dust" (Dt. 32:24). The lion often symbolizes hostile powers; its teeth are emphasized as being especially dangerous: "I lie down among lions that greedily long for human prey. Their teeth are spears and arrows, their tongues sharp swords" (Ps. 57:5[4]). The psalmist's prayer is understandable: "Break the teeth in their mouths, O God; tear out the fangs of the young lions, O Yahweh" (Ps. 58:7[6]; cf. 3:8[7]; Job 4:10; 29:17). The wicked are compared to lions: "The wicked plot against the righteous and gnash their teeth at

---

13. See *BHS* and *HAL,* II, 1594.

14. G. Gerleman, *Ruth — Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (1965), 201; O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. tr. 1994), 247.

15. For the OT see A. Alt, *KlSchr,* I (1953), 341-44; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch. BZAW* 188 (1990), 79-128.

16. Cf. CH §201.

17. H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1974), 200.

them" (Ps. 37:12) — but "Blessed be Yahweh, who has not given us as prey to their teeth" (124:6; cf. 3:8[7]). The baring of teeth is also a threatening gesture in Ps. 35:16; Job 16:9; Lam. 2:16; the gnashing of teeth is an expression of frustrated anger in Ps. 112:10. Prov. 30:14 describes the wicked as a band whose teeth are swords to devour the poor and needy. Job 41:6(14) speaks of the terrifying teeth of the crocodile (Leviathan), which only Yahweh can tame. Joel 1:6 uses the teeth of locusts as an image for the invasion of "greedy" nations. God has delivered the psalmist from the teeth of the enemy (Ps. 124:6); Job boasts of having done the like (Job 29:17).

The book of Job contains two obscure passages that mention teeth. "I take my flesh in my teeth" (13:14) may mean that he ventures his life; "I escape by the skin of my teeth" (19:20) possibly means that Job barely escaped. But the interpretation of this expression is still disputed, and the text may be corrupt.[18]

3. *Proverbs.* An ancient ironic proverb speaks of teeth to illuminate the connection between the sins of the parents and those of their later descendants. This actions-consequences relationship is denied by the prophets of the exilic period: "In those days they shall no longer say, 'The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.' But all shall die for their own sins; the teeth of everyone who eats sour grapes will be set on edge" (Jer. 31:29-30). Ezekiel makes a similar statement: "And the word of Yahweh came to me: What do you mean by repeating this proverb concerning the land of Israel, 'The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'? As I live, says Yahweh, this proverb shall no more be used by you in Israel. . . . It is only the person who sins that shall die" (Ezk. 18:1-4). Eichrodt explains "setting the teeth on edge" as follows: "When one eats grapes that are not as yet quite ripe, but whose slightly bitter taste is all the more refreshing, one as a rule experiences a slightly unpleasant sensation as if a thin coating had come upon one's teeth — as if they had been 'set on edge.'"[19] The ancient concept of collective retribution was finally rejected by the prophets as a false theological doctrine.

Other figurative and proverbial uses of the word *šēn* are found in wisdom literature. In Prov. 10:26 we read: "Like vinegar to the teeth and smoke to the eyes, so are the lazy to their employers." Prov. 25:19 likens the unreliability of a faithless person in a time of trouble to bad teeth, no longer capable of chewing.

4. *Figurative Usage.* The teeth often appear in metaphors illustrating particular situations. Prophets speak of lack of bread between the teeth (Am. 4:6; Mic. 3:5); Nu. 11:33 speaks of meat between the teeth. Abominations are taken away from the teeth (Zec. 9:7). Only Yahweh can deliver from the teeth of the enemy (Ps. 124:6; Job 29:17). In Job 13:14 and 19:20 Job's teeth represent his person by synecdoche.

5. *Ivory.* Elephant tusks and ivory are mentioned frequently. Ezk. 17:15, in a prose section, says that the people dwelling in the isles paid with *qarnôṯ šēn* and ebony. The

18. See the comms. and *HAL,* II, 1594; E. Kutsch, *VT* 32 (1982) 463-84, esp. 473-81.
19. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1970), 234.

term "tooth horns" for ivory accurately describes the visual impact of an elephant when it raises its head and tusks, to the accompaniment of its characteristic "trumpeting."[20]

In the OT ivory is usually a decorative luxury. It was used as wainscoting and also in the manufacture of precious furnishings, in carvings, and in inlaid work in royal palaces. Solomon's throne was made of ivory, overlaid with pure gold (1 K. 10:18; 2 Ch. 9:17). In this context, as in Ezk. 27:6; Am. 3:15; 6:4, Cohen thinks of some kind of wood, possibly called *šēn* because of its visual resemblance to ivory. King Ahab is said to have built an ivory house, which earned him an entry in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel (1 K. 22:39; cf. Ps. 45:9[8]). According to Am. 3:15, however, such ivory houses belonging to the king or to others are doomed to perish. Ezk. 27 describes Tyre as a ship with cabin walls made of ivory (v. 6).

The Song of Songs often uses ivory as an image of beauty and elegance. According to 5:14, the body of the bridegroom is a sheet of ivory encrusted with sapphires; his neck is like an ivory tower (7:5[4]). The image refers to the color or smoothness of his skin.[21] Possibly, however, *šēn* is here a geographical term alluding to a specific locale.[22]

Archaeologists have discovered important ivories at Megiddo (13th century B.C.E.) and Samaria (9th century B.C.E.).[23]

6. *Extended Sense.* In an extended sense *šēn* can mean a rocky crag (1 S. 7:12 [toponym]; 14:4-5; Job 39:28) or the prongs of a fork (*šinnayim,* 1 S. 2:13).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *šēn* with *odoús.* When the meaning is "ivory," the adj. *elephántinos* is used, e.g., *odóntas elephantínous* (Ezk. 27:15), *pýrgos elephántinos* (Cant. 7:5[4]). The three-pronged fork in 1 S. 2:13 is called *kreágra triódous.* When the reference is to a rocky crag, the LXX avoids the tooth metaphor, using *akrōtḗrion* instead (1 S. 7:12; 14:4-5). In Sir. 40:15 *šēn* is represented by *akrótomos.*

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Six occurrences of *šēn* have been found to date in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in very different contexts. In 1QH it is used metaphorically in a lament ("scoffers ground their teeth," 2:11) and in a description of the enemy (God shut the mouth of the enemy, described as aggressive young lions with sharp teeth, 5:10,14). The *lex talionis* from Dt. 19:21 is cited twice in 11QT 61:12. The Copper Scroll uses *šēn* once as a geographical term meaning "spur of rock" *(bšn hslh).*

Kapelrud†

---

20. On the importance and use of ivory in the ancient Near East in general see Schroer, Weippert.

21. Gerleman, *Hohelied,* 198.

22. Cohen; Keel, *Song,* 236.

23. G. Loud, *The Megiddo Ivories. OIP* 52 (1939); J. W. and G. M. Crowfoot, *Early Ivories from Samaria* (London, 1938).

שָׁנָה *šānâ* (Verb)

I. Etymology: 1. General; 2. *šānâ* I; 3. *šānâ* II; 4. *šānâ* III. II. Occurrences and Meaning: 1. *šānâ* I; 2. *šānâ* II; *šānâ* III. III. Theological Usage: 1. *šānâ* I; 2. *šānâ* II; 3. *šānâ* III. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology.

1. *General.* In the case of the vb. *šānâ,* not especially common in OT Hebrew, it appears necessary to distinguish three different roots,[1] although many etymological questions of detail remain unanswered. It is possible to say with assurance that two Proto-Semitic roots have coalesced in Hebrew: *šnw/y,* "be different, be changed, be refractory" (= *šānâ* I), and *ṯny,* "repeat" (= *šānâ* II), although we must reckon with the possibility "that the close relationship between the two meanings suggests that one could have developed from the other, as in Ugaritic, even before the shift of *ṯ* to *š*."[2] In addition, Hebrew clearly has a root *šānâ* III,[3] corresponding to Arab. *sanā,* "shine," and *saniya* I, "become exalted in rank."[4]

2. *šānâ I.* The vb. *šānâ* I is attested in several Semitic languages. In Ugaritic there was probably still a distinction between *šnw,*[5] "start out, leave,"[6] or even "hasten, run,"[7] and *šny,*[8] "be changed" (cf. Akk. *šanû[m]* IV,[9] "be changed, transformed," D stem

---

šānâ. J. Blau, "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln II," *VT* 7 (1957) 98-102, esp. 101-2; J. L. Crenshaw, "The Expression *mî yôḏēa'* in the Hebrew Bible," *VT* 36 (1986) 274-88, esp. 279 n. 13; H. Donner, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 322-50, esp. 324-27; J. A. Emerton, "The Meaning of *šēnā'* in Psalm CXXVII 2," *VT* 24 (1974) 15-31, esp. 25-26; idem, "The Work of D. Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar," *VT* 41 (1991) 287-303, esp. 300-301; B. Halpern, "YHWH's Summary Justice in Job XIV 20," *VT* 28 (1978) 472-74; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 247-87, esp. 280-83; B. Margalit, "Lexicographical Notes on the *Aqht* Epic (Part I; KTU I.17-18)," *UF* 15 (1983) 65-103, esp. 90-91; S. M. Paul, "Unrecognized Biblical Legal Idioms in the Light of Comparative Akkadian Expressions," *RB* 86 (1979) 231-39, esp. 233-35; J. Sanmartín, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon II," *UF* 10 (1978) 349-56, esp. 354; idem, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon III," *UF* 11 (1979) 723-28, esp. 727-28; D. Winton Thomas, "The Root שנה = *sny* in Hebrew," *ZAW* 52 (1934) 236-38.

1. *HAL,* II, 1597-99.

2. Blau, 102.

3. *LexHebAram,* 868; *HAL,* II, 1599.

4. Lane, I/4, 1448-50; Wehr, 436; Emerton, 25-26.

5. *WUS,* no. 2649; *UT,* no. 2448; *CML*², 158.

6. J. C. de Moor, *UF* 11 (1979) 647 n. 54; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980) 383-85.

7. Sanmartín, *UF* 10 (1978) 354; N. Wyatt, *UF* 8 (1976) 423, and n. 75.

8. *KTU* 1.16, I, 12-13; cf. II, 35. According to *WUS,* no. 2647, and *UT,* no. 2453, *šny* may be a denominative from *šn* "tooth," in the sense of "grind one's teeth"; cf. Sanmartín, *UF* 11 (1979) 727-28 n. 62.

9. *AHw,* III, 1166-67; cf. Sanmartín, *UF* 11 (1979) 727-28 n. 62.

"change"). In the Deir ʿAlla texts,[10] according to Müller,[11] *šn*ʾ (piel impf. with energic *nun*) means "change (one's clothing)." In addition, *šānâ* I appears in both Post-Biblical Hebrew and Post-Biblical Aramaic;[12] cf. also Biblical Aram. *šn*ʾ.[13]

3. *šānâ II.* The vb. *šānâ* II is related to Ugar. *ṯny,* "repeat, report,"[14] and Arab. *ṯanā (ṯny),* I "fold," II "double, repeat."[15] In addition, the vb. *šānâ* appears in Post-Biblical Hebrew and *tᵉnâ* in Post-Biblical Aramaic in the sense of "repeat" (niphal) and "recount, proclaim" (intensive).[16] The noun *mišnâ,* "repetition, teaching through repetition" (cf. *miqrāʾ,* "scripture") derives from this root.

4. *šānâ III.* The occurrence of a third verb *šnh* in Biblical Hebrew is disputed, but it is normally associated today with Arab. *sanā* I, "glow, shine"; *saniya,* I "become exalted in rank," II "get out," IV "exalt" (cf. the adj. *sanāʾ,* "of high rank," and the nouns *sanan* and *sanāʾ,* both meaning "luster"[17]). Also probably related are OSA *śnw,* "gleam," and Ugar. *šnw* in *KTU* 1.96, 1, "Anat went and gleamed" *(ʿnt hlkt wšnwt),*[18] and *KTU* 16, VI, 57-58, "You will fall from the pinnacle of your exaltation *(šntk)*";[19] but these passages also admit other interpretations.[20] More probable is the interpretation of the noun *šnm* as deriving from this root,[21] with the meaning "height,"[22] in the attribute of the god El, "king, father of the exalted" or "king, exalted father" *(mlk ʾb šnm),* and in the double name of the deity "bearer and pinnacle" *(ṯkm wšnm).*[23]

II. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *šānâ I.* In OT Hebrew the vb. *šānâ* I occurs just 6 times in the qal, 11 times in the intensive (piel/pual), and once in the hithpael. The qal means "change [intrans.]" (Mal. 3:6; Ps. 77:11[Eng. 10]), "be changed" (Lam. 4:1 [*šn*ʾ[24]]), "differ from" (with *min:* Est. 1:7; 3:8; Sir. 42:24; Prov. 24:21-22; cj. v. 22); the piel, "change [trans.]" (Jer. 2:36; Ps. 89:35[34]), "feign madness" (1 S. 21:14[13]; Ps. 34:1[S]), "change (clothing)" (2 K. 25:39//Jer. 52:33), "disfigure" (Job 14:20; Sir. 12:18; 13:25), "pervert (justice)" (Prov. 31:5); the pual, "be changed" (Eccl. 8:1); the hithpael, "disguise oneself" (1 K. 14:2).

10. II, 10; *ATDA,* 174, 180, 232.
11. H.-P. Müller, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 217, 234.
12. *LOT,* V, 165, §2.15.5; *ANH*³, 429-30; Jastrow, 1605-6.
13. *HAL,* II, 1595-96, with discussion and citations.
14. *WUS,* no. 2898; *UT,* no. 2705; *CML*², 160; cf. Donner, 324-27.
15. Lane, I/1, 356-61; Wehr, 107.
16. *ANH*³, 445; Jastrow, 1605-6, 1681-82.
17. Lane, I/4, 1448-49, 1450; Wehr, 436; Emerton, 25-26.
18. *CML*², 158.
19. Emerton, 25-26; *CML*¹, 47.
20. *HAL,* II, 1599; → שׁנה *šānâ* (noun).
21. *WUS,* no. 2651; *UT,* no. 2451; cf. *TO,* I, 59-60.
22. M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts. SVT* 2 (1955), 33; cf. Margalit, 90-91.
23. H. Gese, in Gese et al., *Die Religionem Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 97, 103.
24. On the confusion of final *h* and ʾ see Meyer, II, §42.5; Wagner, 128, §10.

2. *šānâ II.* The vb. *šānâ* II occurs just 11 times in the qal, with the meaning "repeat." It may be used absolutely (1 K. 18:34 [bis]; Neh. 13:21; Sir. 50:21; Job 29:22; cj. 40:5), with the preps. *b*ᵉ (Prov. 17:9; 26:11) or *l*ᵉ plus personal pronoun (1 S. 26:8; 2 S. 20:10), or with the accusative (Sir. 7:8,14; 33:8; 42:1; [41:23]). There is also one occurrence of the niphal, "be repeated" (Gen. 41:32).

3. *šānâ III.* The disputed vb. *šānâ* III probably occurs just once in the qal in the form *šōnîm,* a plural participle meaning "those of high rank" (Prov. 24:21;[25] cj. Prov. 24:22), and once in the piel, "raise" (Est. 2:9[26]).

III. Theological Usage.

1. *šānâ I.* In the OT *šānâ* I refers to things and to laws, as well as to theological statements, particularly those having to do with the immutability of God. This holds for the 6 occurrences of the qal. Things can "be different" or "change." The precious metal gold cannot literally "change," but it can "grow dim" (*yišne'* [many mss. *yišneh*], Lam. 4:1), as in Jerusalem in the period between its destruction in 587 and the edict of Cyrus in 538: the gold grew dim, the fine gold ugly, and the stones of the sanctuary lay scattered in the streets. The golden goblets at the court of King Artaxerxes had lost none of their glory; rather, they were all "different" or "unique" in form and ornamentation (*w*ᵉ*ḵēlîm mikkēlîm šônîm,* Est. 1:7). Haman, the enemy of the Jews, claimed that all the laws of the Jews were "different from those of any [other] people" (*w*ᵉ*ḏāṯêhem šōnôṯ mikkol-ʿām,* 3:8).[27]

An oracle informs the postexilic community that the harvest has failed because the tithes have not been offered in full; this oracle appeals unambiguously to God's immutability: "For I Yahweh do not change *(lō' šānîṯî)*" (Mal. 3:6).

The hymnic invocation of Yahweh in Ps. 77:11(10) has been the subject of much discussion. Kraus translates: "I am indeed sorry about this, that the right hand of the Most High has changed *(š*ᵉ*nôṯ y*ᵉ*mîn ʿelyôn),*"[28] which he interprets as a statement concerning "the great deeds of Yahweh."[29] But the statement should not be taken as challenging the foundation of Israelite faith: the mutability of God's actions is due solely to human offenses, and the mutability of Yahweh's laws is consequently grounded in the shifting perspective of the sinful observer. Sir. 47:22 asserts God's immutability in a retrospective comment on Israel's history: "The Lord did not turn aside from his mercy and did not alter his promised work."

Most of the 11 occurrences of the intensive stem denote a concrete change, positive or negative. Positively, a parallel tradition records that Evil-merodach, the king of Babylon, "changed [NRSV: put aside] the prison clothes" of Jehoiachin, the king of Judah (*w*ᵉ*šinnā'* [*w*ᵉ*šinnâ,* Jer. 52:33] *'ēṯ biḡḏê ḵil'ô,* 2 K. 25:29). Negatively, texts speak of

25. Thomas; Kopf, 280-83.
26. Thomas, 237; cf. Emerton, 25-28; Crenshaw, 279 n. 1.
27. H. Bardtke, *Esther. KAT* XVII/5 (1963), 318-19.
28. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 113.
29. Ibid., 115-16.

those who "change their ways" (Jer. 2:36) or "alter their words" (Ps. 89:35[34]). People can also pervert social justice. Kings are proverbially admonished not to drink (too much) wine, lest they "pervert the rights of all the afflicted" (*wîšanneh dîn kol-bᵉnê-ʿōnî,* Prov. 31:5).

People can also put on a total false front: someone wishing to do injury "dissembles" *(yšn' pnym),* pretending to help, but then stabs the victim in the back (Sir. 12:18; cf. also 13:25). Similarly, the account of David at the court of King Achish (called Abimelech in Ps. 34:1[S]), in Philistine Gath, says that he "pretended to be mad" (1 S. 21:14[13]; Ps. 34:1[S]). Ecclesiastes contains a parallel but obscure statement: "Wisdom makes one's features shine, but the strength of one's features changes *(wᵉʿōz pānāyw yᵉšunneʾ)*" (Eccl. 8:1). Instead of the pual *yᵉšunneʾ,* some exegetes read the piel *yᵉšanneʾnnû,* "the defiance of his features disfigures him."[30]

Most importantly, the living God can change the situation of an individual radically through mercy, but also through affliction, sickness, and death: God overthrows mortals so that they pass away, changes their being *(mᵉšanneh pānāyw),* and sends them away (Job 14:20).[31]

There is a single instance of *šānâ* I hithpael in 1 K. 14:2, comparable to 1 S. 21:14(13); Ps. 34:1(S); Sir. 12:18; 13:25. King Jeroboam says to his wife: "Go, disguise yourself."

2. *šānâ II.* The 11 instances of *šānâ* II qal all mean "do something again." Typical is the command of the prophet Elijah during the so-called judgment on Mt. Carmel (1 K. 18:34), ordering people repeatedly to pour four jars of water on the burnt offering and on the wood: "'Do it again,' and they did it again" *(šᵉnû wayyišnû).* The connection with the numeral two *(šēnî)* is obvious. It is also clear from the continuation: "And he said, 'Do it a third time,' and they did it a third time" *(šallēšû wayᵉšallēšû).*

In principle, anything can be repeated. The DtrH uses the verb in two passages to emphasize the power of a single stroke of a spear or sword: it was not necessary to "strike twice" to kill (1 S. 26:8, Abishai's request to kill Saul; 2 S. 20:10, Joab's murder of Amasa). And Neh. 13:21 has to do with merchants and sellers who spend the night of the Sabbath outside the walls of Jerusalem and then, infuriating Nehemiah, do so again.

The verb also plays an important role in wisdom: "Like a dog that eats its vomit, so is a fool who repeats his folly *(kᵉsîl šôneh ḇᵉʾiwwaltô)*" (Prov. 26:11); "One who forgives an affront fosters friendship, but one who dwells on [or: repeats] the matter *(wᵉšōneh bᵉḏāḇār)* alienates friends" (Prov. 17:19; cf. Sir. 7:8,14; 33:8; 42:1; 50:21; also 41:23). And in Job's description of his previous happy state, we read: "After I spoke, no one spoke again *(ʾaḥᵃrê ḏᵉḇārî lōʾ yišnû),* and my words dropped upon them" (Job 29:22). Earlier exegetes saw a parallel in Job 40:5, where the MT reads *ʾaḥaṯ*

30. A. Allgeier, *HSAT* VI/2 (1925), 42; K. Galling, *Prediger. HAT* I/18 (²1969), 109; cf. H. W. Hertzberg, *Prediger. KAT* XVII/4 (²1963), 138, 143-44.

31. Halpern.

dibbartî wᵉlōʾ ʾeʿᵉneh, "I have spoken once, and will not answer," and proposed the reading ". . . and will not do so again" *(wᵉlōʾ ʾešneh);*[32] but this emendation is hardly justified.[33]

The only instance of *šnh* II in the niphal functions entirely parallel to its use in the qal. Interpreting Pharaoh's dreams, Joseph says: "The repetition of Pharaoh's dream *(wᵉʿal hiššānôṯ haḥᵃlôm)* means that God will bring the thing to pass surely and swiftly" (Gen. 41:32).

3. *šānâ III.* As many Semitic parallels show,[34] the root *šnh* III has to do with height and exaltation. As far as we can see, there is only one occurrence of the qal, in Prov. 24:21: "My child, fear Yahweh and the king, and do not associate with those of high status *(ʿim-šônîm ʾal-tiṯʿārāḇ).*"[35] Others read *ʿal-šᵉnêhem tiṯʿabbār;* still others read *ûpîḏ šônîm* (MT *šᵉnêhem*[36]) *mî yôḏēaʿ* in the following verse. Kopf reads *šᵉnîhem,* "the disaster of the high estate."[37]

One clear occurrence of *šnh* III in the piel is in the context of Esther's promotion at the court of King Artaxerxes: she found favor with Hegai, who had charge of the women, so that he "advanced" her and her maids to the best place in the harem (Est. 2:9).[38] A more traditional interpretation of the text, based on *šnh* I, is not totally impossible: Hegai "changed her *(wayᵉšannehā)* and her maids to the best in the harem," i.e., "he gave her portion [immediately, before it was due]."[39]

IV. LXX. As one would expect, the LXX varies markedly in translating the Hebrew vb. *šnh.* A differentiation of among the roots is nevertheless observable, especially between I and II.

The occurrences of *šnh* I are normally translated verbally by forms of *alloioún,* "change" (e.g., qal: Mal. 3:6; Lam. 4:1; piel: 1 S. 21:14[13]; 2 K. 25:29; hithpael: 1 K. 14:2; Ps. 34:1[S]). The only pual form (Eccl. 8:1) was clearly interpreted by the translators as deriving from *śnʾ: misthḗsetai,* "(a countenance) grows ugly."

The occurrences of *šnh* II in the qal, together with the single niphal, are usually translated by various forms of *deuteroún* (e.g., qal: 1 S. 26:8; 2 S. 20:10; 1 K. 18:34; Neh. 13:21; Sir. 7:14; 50:21; niphal: Gen. 41:32). In several passages we see that the translators probably read this root, too, as *śnʾ,* "hate," and consequently translated it with *miseín* or *misētós* (Prov. 17:19; 26:11). Here too we occasionally find *alloioún* (Sir. 33:8).

The only reasonably certain instance of the disputed root *šnh* III (*šōnîm,* Prov.

32. *BHK;* G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 531.

33. See *BHS.*

34. See I.4 above.

35. Thomas; Kopf, 280-83.

36. See *BHS.*

37. P. 282.

38. Thomas, 237; Emerton, 25-27; Crenshaw, 279 n. 13.

39. Bardtke, *Esther,* 291, 292 n. 9.

24:21) is translated by *apeithḗsęs* (cf. Syr. *šṭy'*, as in Nu. 5:12).[40] The only occurrence of the intensive (Est. 2:9) is translated by *echrḗsato* (aorist of *chrán*, "give, furnish").

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. The verb *šnh* occurs very rarely in the Dead Sea Scrolls, almost without exception as the piel, hithpael, or niphal of *šnh* I, "change, be changed." The only clear instance of *šnh* II is in 4Q373 1-2, 6.[41] Another possibility is 4Q299 8, 8.

The Manual of Discipline speaks of instructing all the sons of light. It emphasizes that the knowledge of all that is and all that takes place comes from God; before human beings are born, God has determined their plans: "When they come into being, they will execute their works according to his glorious plan, and nothing will be altered *(w'yn lhšnwt)*" (1QS 3:16). The War Scroll presents the "rule for changing the order of the combat battalions" (*srk lšnwt sdr dgly hmlḥmh,* 1QM 9:10). The meaning and translation of another War Scroll text (4Q491 11 1:16) are difficult to determine.

The verb occurs 3 times in the Hymns. The author laments the presence of the wicked: "They have entered my bones to make my spirit stagger and devour strength in accordance with the mysteries of sin, which alter the works of God by their evil *(mšnym m'śy 'l b'šmtm)*" (1QH 5:35-36). In a hymn of praise to Yahweh, we read: "All who know you do not alter your words" (*wkwl ywd'yk l' yšnw dbryk,* 1QH 14:15). A little later, we find a parallel passage: "And how could anyone be able to alter your words?" (*w'ykh ywkl kwl lhšnwt 't dbrykh,* 1QH 15:14).

The occurrence of the verb (*šnh* [*'t bgdyw*]) in the regulations governing purity and Sabbath observance in Tohorot A (4Q274 1 1:3) probably has to do with changing clothing. The narrative text 4Q462 1 16 says that the hardness of Jerusalem's face will be changed to brightness *('z pnyh ytšnh bzywh);* the construction has a close parallel in Eccl. 8:1.[42]

Kronholm†

40. Thomas; Kopf, 280-83.

41. E. Schuller, in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds., *Madrid Qumran Congress, II. STDJ* 11/2 (1992), 522.

42. M. Smith, *RevQ* 15 (1991/92) 73-74.

שָׁנָה *šānâ* (Noun)

I. 1. The Word; 2. LXX. II. 1. Ancient Near East: 1. Mesopotamia; 2. Syria; 3. Egypt. III. OT: 1. Calendar; 2. Modifications; 3. Cultic and Legal Contexts; 4. Anthropological and Theological Significance. IV. Deuterocanonical Books. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šānâ. E. Auerbach, "Das Fest der Lese am Abschluss des Jahres," *VT* 3 (1953) 186-87; idem, "Neujahrs- und Versöhnungs-Fest in den biblischen Quellen," *VT* 8 (1958) 337-43; idem, "Die Umschaltung vom judäischen auf den babylonischen Kalender," *VT* 10 (1960) 69-70; idem, "Der Wechsel des Jahres-Anfangs in Juda im Lichte der neugefundenen babylonischen Chronik," *VT* 9 (1959) 113-21; J. M. Baumgarten, "The Calendars of the Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll," *VT* 37 (1987) 71-78; J. von Beckerath, "Kalender," *LexÄg,* III, 297-99; J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quellen des Rahmens der Königsbücher. BHT* 3 (1929, [2]1966); H. Cazelles, "Nouvel An IV," *DBS,* VI, 620-45; D. J. Clines, "The Evidence for an Autumnal New Year in Pre-Exilic Israel Reconsidered," *JBL* 93 (1974) 22-40; idem, "Regnal Year Reckoning in the Last Years of the Kingdom of Judah," *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 2 (1972/73) 9-34; D. Correns, "Jobeljahr," *BHHW,* II, 868; idem, "Sabbatjahr," *BHHW,* III, 1635-36; P. R. Davies, "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins," *CBQ* 45 (1983) 80-89; I. Engnell, "New Year Festivals," *Critical Essays on the OT* (London, 1970), 180-84; J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* (Princeton, 1964); S. Gandz, "The Calendar of Ancient Israel," *FS J. M. Millás Vallicroza,* I (Barcelona, 1954), 623-46; U. Glessmer, "Der 364-Tage-Kalender und die Sabbatstruktur seiner Schaltungen in ihrer Bedeutung für den Kult," in D. R. Daniels et al., eds., *Ernten, was man sät. FS K. Koch* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991), 311-28; J. van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars* (Leiden, [2]1961); W. Helck, "Jahresrispe," *LexÄg,* III, 236-37; S. Herrmann, *Time and History* (Eng. tr. 1981); S. H. Horn and L. H. Wood, "The Fifth-Century Jewish Calendar at Elephantine," *JNES* 13 (1954) 1-20; H. Hunger, "Kalender," *RLA,* V, 297-303; A. Jepsen, "Zur Chronologie des Priesterkodex," *ZAW* 47 (1929) 251-55; A. Jepsen and R. Hanhart, *Untersuchungen zur israelitisch-jüdischen Chronologie. BZAW* 88 (1964); A. Jirku, "Das israelitische Jobeljahr," *Von Jerusalem nach Ugarit* (Graz, 1966), 319-29; P. Kaplony, "Jahrestäfelchen," *LexÄg,* III, 237-38; S. Kreuzer, "430 Jahre, 400 Jahre oder 4 Generationen," *ZAW* 98 (1966) 199-210; K. G. Kuhn, "Zum essenischen Kalender," *ZAW* 52 (1961) 65-73; E. Kutsch, "'. . . am Ende des Jahres,'" *ZAW* 83 (1971) 15-21 = *KlSchr,* 64-70; idem, "Chronologie III. Israelitisch-jüdische Chronologie," *RGG*[3], I, 1812-14; idem, *Die chronologischen Daten des Ezechielbuches. OBO* 62 (1985); idem, "Erlassjahr," *RGG*[3], II, 568-69; idem, "Das Jahr der Katastrophe," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 520-45 = *KlSchr,* 3-28; idem, "Jobeljahr," *RGG*[3], III, 799-800; A. Laato, "New Viewpoints on the Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 210-21; G. Larsson, "The Chronology of the Pentateuch," *JBL* 102 (1983) 401-9; N. P. Lemche, "The Manumission of Slaves — The Fallow Year — The Sabbatical Year — The Jobel Year," *VT* 26 (1976) 38-59; H. and J. Lewy, "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar," *HUCA* 17 (1942/43) 1-152c; J. Lewy, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda* (Giessen, 1927); A. Malamat, "The Last King of Judah and the Fall of Jerusalem," *IEJ* 18 (1968) 137-56; J. A. Montgomery, "The Year-Eponymate in the Hebrew Monarchy," *JBL* 49 (1930) 311-19; J. Morgenstern, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, Its Origin and Its Character," *VT* 5 (1955) 34-76; idem, "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel, VI: The History of the Calendar in Israel During the Biblical Period," *HUCA* 21 (1948) 365-496; idem, "The New Year for Kings," *Occident and Orient. FS M. Gastler* (London, 1936), 439-56; N. M. Nicolskij, "Die Entstehung des Jobeljahres," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 216; R. North, "Maccabean Sabbath Years," *Bibl* 34 (1953) 501-15; idem, *Sociology of the Biblical*

I. 1. *The Word.* The lexicons distinguish multiple roots *šnh,* but differ substantially in their analysis. *GesB*[1] recognizes *šnh* I, "do again," and *šnh* II, "change," and associates the noun *šānâ,* "year," with the latter.[2] *KBL²* lists just a single root *šnh,*[3] from which it derives the noun, with the meaning "that which succeeds another period of time," a "renewal of time."[4] The Aramaic section of *KBL²*, however, separates *šnh* I, "change," from *šnh* II = *tnh,* "do again."[5] Finally, *HAL* starts with two different roots, *šnh* I *(šny),* "change, be different," and *šnh* II, *(ṯny),* "do again,"[6] which have coalesced in Hebrew.[7] A third root, *šnh* III, should also be posited;[8] it is related to the Arabic vb. *sanā/saniya,* "shine, glow; be high, exalted in rank."

Jubilee. AnBibl 4 (1954); H. Otten, "Ein Text zum Neujahrsfest aus Bogazköy," *OLZ* 51 (1956) 101-5; L. I. Pap, *Das israelitische Neujahrsfest* (Kampen, 1933); R. A. Parker, *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt. SAOC* 26 (1950); R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.–A.D. 75. Brown University Studies* 19 (Providence, ⁴1971); G. Pettinato, "Il calendario di Ebla al tempo del re Ibbi-Sipis sulla base di TM. 75. G. 427," *AfO* 25 (1974/77) 1-36; O. Plöger, "'Siebzig Jahre,'" in J. Herrmann, ed., *FS F. Baumgärtel. Erlanger Forschungen* 10 (1959), 124-30 = *Aus der Spätzeit des AT* (Göttingen, 1971), 67-73; R. Rendtorff, "Die Entwicklung des altisraelitischen Festkalenders," in J. Assmann, ed., *Das Fest und das Heilige* (Gütersloh, 1991), 185-205; W. Rordorf, "Jahr," *BHHW,* II, 792-95; N. Sarna, "Zedekiah's Emancipation of Slaves and the Sabbatical Year," in H. A. Hoffner, ed., *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 143-49; G. Sauer, "The chronologischen Angaben in den Büchern Deut. bis 2. Kön.," *TZ* 24 (1968) 1-14; J. Schaumberger, "Die neue Seleukiden-Liste BM 35603 und die makkabäische Chronologie," *Bibl* 36 (1955) 423-35; B. Schmitz, "Jahreszählung," *LexÄg,* III, 238-40; J. B. Segal, "Intercalation and the Hebrew Calendar," *VT* 7 (1957) 250-307; idem, "שָׁנָה," *EMiqr,* VIII, 197-209; N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival* (London, 1947); J. A. Soggin, "Das Erdbeben von Am 1,1 und die Chronologie der Könige Ussia und Jotham von Juda," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 117-21; S. Talmon, *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem, 1986); idem, "'400 Jahre' oder 'vier Generationen' (Gen 15,13-15)," in E. Blum et al., eds., *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 13-25; E. R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids, ²1965); idem, "New Evidence on the Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah," *BASOR* 143 (1956) 22-27; A. Ungnad, "Datenlisten," *RLA,* II, 131-94; idem, "Eponymen," *RLA,* II, 412-57; J. C. VanderKam, "2 Maccabees 6,7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem," *JSJ* 12 (1981) 52-74; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr;* P. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes (Laubhüttenfest)* (Tübingen, 1912); B. Z. Wacholder, "The Calendar of Sabbath Years During the Second Temple Era," *HUCA* 54 (1983) 123-33; M. Weippert, "Kalender und Zeitrechnung," *BRL²*, 165-68; W. Zimmerli, "Das 'Gnadenjahr des Herrn,'" in A. Kuschke and E. Kutsch, eds., *Archäologie und AT. FS K. Galling* (Tübingen, 1970), 321-32 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie. ThB* 51 (1974), 222-34.

→ יובל *yôḇēl;* שבת *šabbāṯ;* דרור *d^erôr.*

1. Pp. 850-51.
2. Cf. *VG,* I, 334; *NSS,* 8; J. Barth, *ZDMG* 41 (1887) 620-21.
3. Pp. 996-97.
4. Finegan, 18.
5. Pp. 1133, 1137.
6. *HAL,* II, 1597-99; cf. *KBL²*, xlii.
7. J. Blau, *VT* 7 (1957) 101-2.
8. *HAL,* II, 1599.

The noun *šānâ* is found in all Semitic languages except Old South Arabic and Ethiopic. It derives from none of these roots,[9] but should be considered a primary noun.[10]

The noun *šānâ* occurs 877 times in the OT.[11] In Hebrew inscriptions it appears as *št;* it also occurs in Middle Hebrew and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In Jewish Aramaic the noun is *šattā'* or (undetermined) *šᵉnā'*. Other forms include Biblical Aram. *šᵉnâ,* Phoen./Pun. *št* (pl. *šnt*),[12] Moab. *št,*[13] Ammon. pl. *šnt,* Ugar. *šnt* (pl. *šnt,* dual *šntm*), and Akk. *šattu.*[14]

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates the noun *šānâ* by *étos* or *eniautós.*[15]

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *Mesopotamia.* The Mesopotamian calendar was based on the lunar month, twelve of which constitute the year (ca. 354 days). The annual difference of eleven days between the lunar and solar years was adjusted by the insertion of an intercalary month, at first randomly, after the 8th century B.C.E. with seven intercalary months spread over nineteen years.[16] To record the date and sequence of certain events, the Babylonians named the years after outstanding events, while the Assyrians also employed the names of the highest imperial officials, summarized in lists called "eponym canons."[17] (Analysis of the list of Solomon's officials in 1 K. 4:2-3 convinced Montgomery that the early Israelite monarchy also used eponym years.)[18] Use of the regnal years of kings for dating was introduced in Babylon during the Kassite period. An enumeration independent of the regnal years of individual rulers was introduced under the Seleucids; it begins according to Babylonian reckoning on 1 Nisan 311.[19]

In Babylonia the new year began around the time of the vernal equinox. In Assyria, in the Kültepe period (19th/18th century) the year began in late fall, insofar as it was defined by an eponym; in the 1st millennium the Babylonian calendar was introduced.[20]

---

9. *HAL,* II, 1600.

10. *BLe,* §61g.

11. *KBL²*, 997; according to *HAL,* II, 1600, 876 times; according to Even-Shoshan, 2208-12, 874 times.

12. J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizsch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (²1970), §240, no. 18; *DISO,* 312.

13. *DISO,* 312.

14. *KBL²*, 997; *HAL,* II, 1600; *AHw,* III, 1201.

15. Finegan, 18.

16. Parker and Dubberstein, 1-3.

17. Ungnad, 131-34, 412.

18. P. 318.

19. Schaumberger; Parker and Dubberstein, 20-24; on the whole subject see Weippert, 165, 167-68; S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal II. AOAT* 5/2 (1983), 381-410.

20. Hunger, 298-99; on the whole question see Finegan, 29-33.

Assyria observed the practice of a fallow year *(karabḫu);* fields lay fallow one year and were cultivated the next.[21]

Akkadian also uses compound expressions such as *ūmē u šanāti,* "days and years," and *ūmē īṣūtim/šanāt ḫušaḫḫim,* "days of want/years of hunger."[22]

2. *Syria.* At Ebla the year began in the fall.[23] At Ugarit the noun *šnt* is well attested.[24] At the dedication of Baal's palace, yearling calves are sacrificed.[25] We then read that years pass, and in the seventh year Mot comes to Aliyan Baal.[26] A period of seven or eight years is mentioned frequently.[27] Anat says to Aqhat: "I will let you count years with Baal."[28]

In El's title *mlk 'b šnm,*[29] the pl. *šnm* derives from *šnh* III, so that the title means "father of the exalted" or "exalted father,"[30] or perhaps "father of the high heavenly dwelling,"[31] not "father of years."[32] The proposal of Eissfeldt to associate *šnm* with the root *šny,* "change, depart," and interpret *'b šnm* as "father of mortals" has not found acceptance.[33] Lipiński interprets *'b šnm* as "father of Shunami/Shumaliya," a goddess who plays a role in Kassite mythology.[34] The title, in this reading, indicates the superiority of El over the Kassite goddess.

In the address of Krt to his son Yṣb, *tqln bgbl šntk*[35] means "fall from the pinnacle of your pride."[36] But *šntk* can also be understood as *šnt,* "year," so that the meaning would be "may you fall down at the frontier of your years."[37] The double name of the deity *ṯkm wšnm*[38] means "bearer and pinnacle."[39]

The blessing of the gods is invoked for "a thousand days, ten thousand years, for-

---

21. D. Opitz, *ZA* 37 (1927) 104-6.

22. Y. Avishur, *UF* 7 (1975) 40.

23. Pettinato, 33; Hunger, 299.

24. *UT,* no. 2447; *WUS,* no. 2646.

25. *KTU* 1.4, VI, 43.

26. *KTU* 1.6, V, 8-9.

27. *KTU* 1.6, V, 8-9; 1.12, II, 44; 1.15, III, 22; 1.19, I, 42; IV, 15, 17-18; 1.23, 66.

28. *KTU* 1.17, VI, 28-29.

29. *KTU* 1.6, I, 36; etc.; cf. *UT,* no. 2451.

30. M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts. SVT* 2 (1955), 33; B. Margalit, *UF* 15 (1983) 90-91; J. Gray, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 ([2]1965), 156; H. Gese, in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* X/2 (1970), 97-98.

31. *WUS,* no. 2651.

32. H. Bauer, *ZAW* 51 (1933) 82; J. C. de Moor, *UF* 1 (1969) 179; cf. S. B. Parker, *UF* 2 (1970) 246, 248.

33. O. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon. BSAW* 98/r (1951), 30-31 n. 4.

34. E. Lipiński, *OLP* 2 (1971) 66-67.

35. *KTU* 1.16, VI, 57-58.

36. *WUS,* no. 2650; *CML,* 47.

37. *HAL,* II, 1599; *CML*[2], 102.

38. *UT,* no. 2676.

39. Gese, *Religionen,* 102-3; contra O. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* II (1963), 529, 539, who — following R. Dussaud, *Syr* 12 (1931) 67-75; H. Bauer, *ZAW* 51 (1933) 99 — sees behind the double name the Kassite deities Shuqamuna and Shumaliya/Shimaliya.

ever."[40] At the end of the Pyrgi inscription[41] the stars are described as models of longevity: "May the years of the deity in her temple be years like the stars of El."[42] We also find at Ugarit a number of word combinations that appear in the OT as well.[43]

The Ugaritic year began in the fall.[44]

Beyond Ugarit we find many dates identified by regnal years,[45] suffetes (in Punic territory),[46] Roman officials,[47] incumbent priests,[48] various eras,[49] or someone's age.[50] The historical datings in the Mesha inscription[51] deserve special mention, as do the common blessing: "May the 'Lord of Heaven' and the 'Lady of Byblos' and the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos prolong the days of Yḥmlk and his years over Byblos,"[52] and the curse: "For seven years the locust shall devour."[53] We may also mention an Ammonite inscription from Tell Siran, which concludes with the words: "may he rejoice and be glad for many days and long years."[54]

Like Ugaritic, Phoenician has several word pairs in common with Hebrew.[55]

3. *Egypt.* From the 3d millennium on, Egypt made use of the solar year. Each year, 5 intercalary days were added to the 12 months of 30 days each, to make up the 365 days of the solar year.[56] Initially, as in Mesopotamia, the years were named after outstanding events. Dating by the regnal years of the king was introduced during the 11th Dynasty.[57] Since the Neolithic period, the beginning of the year coincided with the annual rising of the Nile toward the end of June. A more precise determination than the often irregular flooding permitted was provided by the heliacal rising of Sirius, which at that time coincided roughly with the beginning of the Nile's flooding. For some seasonal festivals and the temple cult, a lunar calendar continued in use.[58]

We may also mention the labels of ivory or wood on stone oil containers of the 1st

40. *KTU* 5.9, I, 2-6.

41. *KAI* 277.9-11.

42. J. A. Fitzmyer, *JAOS* 86 (1966) 286-87, 294-96; S. B. Parker, *UF* 2 (1970) 247-48.

43. M. J. Dahood, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs," *RSP,* I, 203-5, 207, 364-65 (nos. 234, 238, 241, 572-74); J. Khanjian, "Wisdom," *RSP,* II, 397 (no. 43); see also S. Gevirtz, *JNES* 30 (1971) 89-90; K. T. Aitken, *UF* 21 (1989) 34.

44. O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel* (1990), 122.

45. *KAI* 14.1; 32.1; 33.1; etc.

46. *KAI* 66.2; 77.3; etc.

47. *KAI* 118.2.

48. *KAI* 159.5.

49. *KAI* 18.4-5; 60.1.

50. *KAI* 134.2; 142.2-3; etc.

51. *KAI* 181.2, 8.

52. *KAI* 4.3-6; cf. 6.3; 7.5; 10.9; 26A.III.6; 26C.III.20.

53. *KAI* 222A.27; cf. 223A.5-6.

54. O. Loretz, *UF* 9 (1977) 169-71; cf. Ps. 61:7(Eng. 6).

55. Y. Avishur, *UF* 7 (1975) 39-40.

56. *AncIsr,* I, 188-89.

57. Weippert, 165, 167-68; Schmitz, 238-39.

58. Von Beckerath, 297, 299; on the whole subject see Finegan, 21-29; E. Brunner-Traut, *Frühformen des Erkennens* (1990), 137-38.

Dynasty, which record the year they were written, the name of the king or responsible official, the tax paid, and the quality and quantity of oil.[59]

In prehistoric times notches were cut on a palm branch stripped of leaves as an aid for remembering the number of years a chieftain held office. The hieroglyph for "year" represents such a branch. A bundle of such branches stands for "annals." The presentation of several branches by a god represents symbolically the gift of many regnal years.[60]

III. OT.

1. *Calendar.* The very first occurrence of *šānâ* in the OT reflects what is by far the commonest use of the noun: the heavenly bodies serve as signs to determine times, days, and years (Gen. 1:14 [P]), i.e., to establish the calendar. In most of its occurrences *šānâ* stands in the context of giving a date or someone's age.

The earliest Semitic form of the year has been found to be the Amorite year, consisting of seven agricultural periods of fifty days each. To fill out the year, fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen days were intercalated (cf. Lev. 23:15; Dt. 16:19).[61] The earliest example of a calendar in the territory of ancient Israel is the "agricultural calendar" from Gezer (10th century),[62] which has the year begin with the olive harvest in October/November. The OT evidence indicates that a variety of calendrical systems existed. Originally the year began in the fall (Ex. 23:16; 34:22), while P has the year begin in the spring (Ex. 12:2). Whether there was ever New Year's Day on the seventh day of the tenth month[63] is dubious.[64] In any case there was never a New Year's Festival called *rō'š haššānâ* during the OT period. Ezk. 40:1 can mean only "the beginning of the year" in general, more specifically the beginning of the Babylonian vernal year, in the month of Nisan. Lev. 23:27 and 25:9-10 have no connection with Ezk. 40:1. Neither do Ex. 12:2; Lev. 23:24-25; Nu. 29:1-6; Neh. 7:72–8:12 have any bearing on a New Year's Festival. The festival on the first day of the seventh month is simply a more solemn new moon festival, which marks the beginning of a festal month and may preserve memories of the ancient beginning of the year in the fall.[65]

The change from fall to spring as the beginning of the year is probably due to Mesopotamian influence. The dating of this change is disputed, as is the question whether Israel and Judah had different calendric systems.[66]

59. Kaplony, 237.

60. Helck.

61. Rordorf, 793.

62. *KAI* 182.

63. Weippert, 165-66; Zimmerli, *Studien,* 226.

64. *RGG*³, I, 1812.

65. *AncIsr,* II, 469-70; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. tr. Richmond, 1966), 85; Auerbach, *VT* 8:337-41; but cf. Engnell, 181, 183-84; J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 58-59.

66. Kutsch, *RGG*³, III, 943-44; Auerbach, *VT* 9; idem, *VT* 10:121; Malamat; Clines, "Regnal Year"; idem, *JBL* 93:40; Morgenstern, *HUCA* 21.

The Israelite year had 12 months (1 K. 4:7; 1 Ch. 27:1-5), making up approximately 354 days. This lunar year had to be adjusted to the solar year and the natural change of seasons by the addition of 11 days. How this adjustment took place we do not know. Perhaps a trace of the process is preserved in Gen. 7:11 and 8:14.[67]

Like Mesopotamia and Egypt, Israel used major events to designate years (Am. 1:1;[68] Isa. 20:1). For the most part, however, events were dated by the regnal years of the kings. In the Hellenistic period the Seleucid era was introduced, beginning (by Syrian and Macedonian reckoning) on the first day of Dios (the seventh day of the tenth month), 312 B.C.E.[69]

In accordance with the nature of the Primal History and the premonarchic society it presumes, texts stating the age of individuals predominate in Genesis; without exception they belong to P. First comes the genealogy in Gen. 5, in which *šānâ* occurs 48 times. The noun is associated with extraordinarily high numbers; in the SP and LXX many of these differ substantially from the MT. Citing the analogous list of antediluvian Sumerian kings, Westermann rightly says: "The numbers in Gen 5 have no connection whatsoever with the political institution of the kingship. They describe the generations of humankind as they stretch back into remote antiquity. . . . The history of humankind . . . cannot be measured by the standards of present-day history."[70] Within the Primal History, other age statements appear in Gen. 7:6,11; 8:13a; 9:28-29; 11:10-26. In Gen. 11, too, the numbers in the SP and LXX differ from those in the MT. The fact that the numbers are lower in Gen. 11 than in Gen. 5 signals the transition from prehistory to history.[71]

In P this history begins with Gen. 11:27. Age statements appear in Gen. 11:32; 12:4; 16:16; 17:1,17,24-25; 21:5; 23:1; 25:7,17,20,26; 26:34; 35:28; 37:2; 41:46; 47:9,28; 50:22,26 (both secondary); Ex. 6:16,18,20; 7:7; Nu. 33:39; Dt. 34:7 (cf. 31:2). According to Jepsen,[72] the chronology of P in the MT leads up to the year 3149 for the building of Solomon's temple. The objective of this calculation is the building of the Second Temple, if 451 years are allowed for the interim. By this reckoning, the Second Temple would have been dedicated in the year 3600 of the world.

In DtrH the first age statements are in Josh. 24:29 = Jgs. 2:8; 1 S. 4:15; 2 S. 19:33,36(32,25). In 1 S. 13:1 (emended), there begins a chronology that states the age of a king at his accession and the duration of his reign (see also 2 S. 2:10; 5:4-5; cf. 2:11; 1 K. 2:11). For Solomon (1 K. 11:42) and Jeroboam I (1 K. 14:20), only the duration of their reign is given (also 2 K. 10:36; cf. 2 K. 14:17); the full formula resumes with Rehoboam (1 K. 14:21) and appears in 2 K. 21:1,19; 22:1; 23:31,36; 24:8,18

---

67. Begrich, 83, 90; *AncIsr*, I, 188-93; Rordorf, 793.

68. Soggin.

69. Schaumberger; Parker and Dubberstein, 20-24; on the whole subject see Weippert; Finegan, 33-44; Kutsch, *RGG*³, I, 1813.

70. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 353; cf. E. Zenger, *Gottes bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (²1987), 144-45.

71. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 561.

72. *ZAW* 47.

(= Jer. 52:1). In 1 K. 15:1-2 there begins a synchronistic dating of the kings of Israel and Judah, maintained until the end of the state of Israel (1 K. 15:9-10,25,28,33; 16:8,10,15,23,29; 22:41-42,52; 2 K. 1:17; 3:1; 8:16-17,25-26; 9:29; 12:1-2[11:21; 12:1]; 13:1,10; 14:1-2,23; 15:1-2[cf. 14:21],8,13,17,23,27,30,32-33; 16:1-2; 17:1; 18:1-2; many of these datings involve conflicts that are difficult to resolve). This system goes back to DtrH, who may have been able to draw on an already existing "synchronistic chronicle."[73]

The institution of kingship makes it possible to date events by regnal years, which DtrH probably took from the "journals" of Solomon and the kings of Israel and Judah:[74] 1 K. 6:1,37-38; 14:25; 2 K. 12:7(6); 17:6; 18:9-10,13 (= Isa. 36:1); 22:3; 23:23; 25:1-2 (= Jer. 52:4-5). Outside DtrH, such dates appear in Jer. 1:2-3; 25:1,3; 28:1;[75] 32:1; 36:1,9; 39:1-2; 45:1; 46:2; 51:59; Dnl. 1:1. An era based on the exile of Jehoiachin appears in 2 K. 25:27 (= Jer. 52:31); Ezk. 1:2; 8:1; 20:1; 24:1 (cf. 2 K. 25:1); 26:1; 29:1,17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1,17; 33:21; 40:1 (with a second date based on the fall of Jerusalem[76]). Dates based on the regnal years of foreign rulers appear in 2 K. 24:12; 25:8 (= Jer. 52:12); Jer. 25:1; 32:1; 52:28-30; Hag. 1:1,15; 2:10; Zec. 1:1,7; 7:1l Est. 1:3; 2:16; 3:7; Dnl. 1:21; 2:1; 8:1; 9:1-2; 10:1; 11:1; Ezr. 1:1; 7:7-8; Neh. 1:1; 2:1; 5:14; 13:6.

The dates in the books of Chronicles are largely dependent on DtrH (1 Ch. 3:4; 29:27; 2 Ch. 3:2; 9:30; 12:2,13; 16:13; 20:31; 21:5,20; 22:2; 24:1; 25:1,25; 26:1,3; 27:1,8; 28:1; 29:1; 33:1,21; 34:1,8; 35:19; 36:2,5,9,11). Dates unique to the Chronicler appear in 1 Ch. 26:31; 2 Ch. 15:10,19; 16:1,12; 17:7; 29:3; 34:3. In agreement with the intention of the Chronicler, a synchronistic dating appears in 2 Ch. 13:1-2 (cf. 1 K. 15:1-2). The text of 2 Ch. 36:22 is identical with Ezr. 1:1, signaling the continuity of ChrH.[77] Ezr. 3:8 uses an era based on "arrival in Jerusalem."

For the Aramaic sections of the OT, see Dnl. 6:1(5:31); 7:1l; Ezr. 4:24; 5:13; 6:3,15.

In this context it should be noted that a postdating system was customary in Mesopotamia, whereas an antedating system was used in Egypt. In the earlier period of the Israelite and Judahite monarchy, antedating was probably used; in the period of the later Judahite monarchy, postdating. In the latter, the official count began with the regnal "new year"; the period between a king's accession and the "new year" was not included in the total years of his reign. It is disputed whether regnal years in Judah were defined according to the Babylonian Nisan calendar or the Tishri calendar of the Judahite civil year.[78]

Time expressions not associated with any particular system appear in Gen. 14:4-5 (similar in style to royal inscriptions);[79] 16:3; 29:18,20,27,30; 31:38,41; 41:1,26-

73. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des AT. TW* 1 (⁴1989), 121.
74. Ibid., 138.
75. See *BHS*.
76. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 9-11.
77. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Esra. KAT* XIX/1 (1985), 40.
78. Malamat, 146-47; Clines, "Regnal Year," 33; *AncIsr*, I, 192.
79. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 195-96.

27,29-30,34 (spans of seven days, years, etc., are very common);[80] 47:28; Ex. 23:29; Nu. 13:22; Jgs. 3:8,14; 4:3; 6:1; 9:22; 10:2-3,8; 11:26; 12:7,9,11,14; 15:20; 16:31; 1 S. 7:2; 2 S. 4:4; 13:23,38; 14:28; 15:7; 21:1; 24:13; 1 K. 2:39; 6:38; 7:1; 9:10; 18:1; 22:1-2; 2 K. 8:1-3; 11:3-4; 17:5; 20:6 (cf. Isa. 38:5); 24:1; Isa. 7:8; 16:14; 20:3; 21:16; 23:15,17; Jer. 28:3,11; Ezk. 1:1 (secondary? does "thirty" refer to the age of the prophet? cf. Nu. 4:30);[81] 29:11-13; 39:9; Job 42:16; Ruth 1:4; Dnl. 1:5; Neh. 5:14; 1 Ch. 2:21; 21:12 (cf. 2 S. 24:13); 2 Ch. 8:1 (cf. 1 K. 9:10); 11:17; 13:23(14:1); 22:12; 23:1 (cf. 2 K. 11:3-4); 24:15; 27:5.

Gen. 15:13 poses a special problem, stating that Abraham's offspring will dwell in an alien land for 400 years. Gen. 15:16 has four generations dwell in Egypt, and Ex. 12:40-41 speaks of 430 years. According to Talmon, the two statements in Gen. 15:13,16 are "'identical' from a literary perspective."[82] The "functional" equivalence of the two statements arises from the circumstance that they are slightly different realizations of the "topped triad" (4 = 3 + 1). Probably the statement in v. 16 is based on the 40-year schema found primarily in the exodus and wilderness tradition; v. 13 presumably reflects a 100-year schema, found also in Isa. 65:20 (cf. Gen. 17:17; 23:1) as well as in the Egyptian Papyrus Insinger, which sets the life span of a generation at 100 years. Ex. 12:40-41 represents an independent tradition, which appears also in Ezk. 4:4-6 (cf. CD 1:5-6).[83] An unconvincing solution to the problem has been proposed by Kreuzer.[84]

The 40-year schema just mentioned appears in Ex. 16:35; Nu. 14:33-34; 32:13; Dt. 1:3; 2:7 (cf. 2:14); 8:2,4; 29:4; Josh. 5:6 (cf. 14:7,10); Am. 2:10; 5:25; Ps. 95:10; Neh. 9:21 with reference to Israel's period in the wilderness. The schema, which is probably of Dtr origin, appears also in Jgs. 3:11,30; 5:31; and 8:28 for the period of rest after deliverance from enemy oppression, and in Jgs. 13:1 for the period of Philistine hegemony (cf. also 1 S. 4:18; 2 S. 5:4; 1 K. 2:11; 11:42). The span of 40 years probably refers to the time "in which one group of active adult men is completely replaced by the next."[85]

Now 1 K. 6:1 gives 480 years as the period from the exodus to the fourth year of Solomon's reign, when work on the temple was begun. Behind this number stands the 40-year schema (480 = 12 × 40).[86] The Dtr redactors considered the exodus the defining date for Israel's history, leading after 12 generations to the building of the temple.[87] The number 480 is "not a fabrication; it is founded on the copious information about dates which he found in his sources and used in his works and on a series of dates . . . which he himself inserted but which sprang from the traditional view of the course of

80. Idem, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 90-91.
81. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 113-14.
82. "400 Years," 18.
83. Ibid., 19-21, 24-25; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 166-68.
84. Pp. 209-10.
85. M. Noth, *DH,* 37.
86. Sauer, 4-6.
87. Herrmann, 130-31.

history."[88] In addition, we also find in P an era dating from the exodus from Egypt (Ex. 40:17; Nu. 1:1; 9:1; 10:11; 33:38).

The 70 years of Babylonian rule mentioned in Jer. 25:11-12 (cf. Jer. 19:10) also pose a problem. The same span of time appears in Zec. 1:12; 7:5; Dnl. 9:2; 2 Ch. 36:21. While Jeremiah may be speaking in round numbers, the 70 years in Zechariah can be taken literally, if we think of the period from 586 to 515, when the postexilic temple was dedicated. It is important to the Chronicler to include the seventy years recorded in the Jeremiah tradition. By drawing on Lev. 26:34-35, he can treat this figure as a round number covering the period to the beginning of Persian rule. The author of Daniel is dealing with the question whether the anti-Jewish measures imposed under Antiochus Epiphanes can be included in the period of 70 years set down in Jeremiah, which would mean that a final restoration of Israel could still be expected. In 9:24-27, therefore, he interprets Jeremiah's words as referring to weeks of years, although the calculation is not transparent.[89]

Very general time expressions appear in Gen. 17:21; 26:12; 47:17-18; Josh. 5:12; Jgs. 10:8;[90] 1 S. 1:7; 7:16 (*šānâ bᵉšānâ*, "year by year"); 29:3 (*yāmîm/šānîm*, "for days and years"); 1 K. 4:7; 5:25(11); 10:14,22 (*'aḥaṯ lᵉšālōš šānîm*, "every three years"),25; 17:1; 2 K. 13:20; 17:4 (*kᵉšānâ ḇᵉšānâ*, "annual tribute"); Isa. 32:10; Jer. 28:1,16-17; 51:46; Ezk. 38:8 (*bᵉ'aḥᵃrîṯ haššānîm*, "at the end of years"); 38:17; Zec. 7:3; 14:16; Est. 9:21,27; Dnl. 11:6 (*lᵉqēṣ šānîm*, "after years"),8,13;[91] 1 Ch. 27:1; 2 Ch. 9:13,21,24; 14:5(6); 18:2; 24:5; Ezr. 5:11 (Aramaic); Neh. 9:30; 10:33,35.

2. *Modifications.* Numerous expressions specify the nature and significance of the noun *šānâ*. The texts speaks of "good years" (Gen. 41:35), "years of famine" (Gen. 41:27,30,36,50,54; cf. 45:6,11; 2 S. 24:13), "years of plenty" (Gen. 41:29,47-48,[92]53); "years in which there will be neither plowing nor harvest" (45:6); "years of sojourning," which are "few and hard" (47:9); a "year of drought" (Jer. 17:8). An oracle of Isaiah to Hezekiah (secondary[93]) speaks of a year in which people will eat the "second growth," a second year in which they will eat the "wild growth," and a third year in which they will sow, reap, plant vineyards, and eat their fruit (2 K. 19:29 = Isa. 37:30). There are years that the swarming locust has eaten (Joel 2:25).

There are years of someone's death (Isa. 6:1; 14:28), "years of a hired worker/day laborer" (Isa. 16:14; 21:16), "years of generation and generation," i.e., untold generations (Dt. 32:7; Joel 2:2[94]), "years long past" (Mal. 3:4).

Years may be defined by memorable events (Isa. 20:1; Jer. 52:31; Am. 1:1). A year may be called a "year of punishment/affliction" (Jer. 11:23; 23:12; 48:44), a "year of

88. Noth, *DH*, 43.
89. Plöger.
90. See *BHS*.
91. See *BHS*.
92. See *BHS*.
93. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 416.
94. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 37.

vindication" (Isa. 34:8; 63:4[95]). Ezk. 4:5 speaks of "years of guilt/punishment" (cf. v. 6).

A year ends (*tmm*, Gen. 47:18) and has a beginning (*rō'š*, Ezk. 40:1).[96] The festival of harvest is celebrated "at the end of the year" (*bᵉṣē't haššānâ*, Ex. 23:16) or at the "turn of the year" (*tᵉqûpaṯ haššānâ*, Ex. 34:22; 2 Ch. 24:3). The eyes of Yahweh are always on the land of Israel, "from the beginning of the year to the end of the year" (*mērē'šîṯ haššānâ wᵉʿaḏ 'aḥᵃrîṯ šānâ*, Dt. 11:12[97]). The "return of the year" (*tᵉšûḇaṯ haššānâ*) is the time when kings go out to battle (2 S. 11:1; 1 K. 20:22,26; 1 Ch. 20:1; 2 Ch. 36:10).

The expression *ṣē'ṯ haššānâ* almost certainly means the "departure" of the year,[98] hardly its "coming forth."[99] The expression *tᵉqûpaṯ haššānâ* denotes the endpoint of the "cycle" of the year. The expression *tᵉšûḇaṯ haššānâ* means "return of the year." When the year begins in the fall, this would be "the time when the year was half over, and beginning to return from winter to summer, . . . our spring equinox."[100]

3. *Cultic and Legal Contexts.* In the cultic domain *šānâ* is used primarily in contexts that define the time of festivals and other observances (Ex. 12:2; 23:14,16-17; 30:10; 34:22-24; Lev. 16:34; 23:41; Nu. 28:14; Dt. 15:20; 16:16; Jgs. 11:40;[101] 1 K. 9:25;[102] 2 Ch. 8:13). Other time statements refer to the age of animals fit for cultic or sacrificial use (Ex. 12:5; 29:38; Lev. 9:3; 12:6; 14:10; 23:12,18-19; Nu. 6:12,14; 7:15,17,21,23, 27,29,33,35,39,41,45,47,51,53,57,59,63,65,69,71,75,77,81,83,87-88; 15:17; 28:3,9,11, 19,27; 29:2,8,13,17,20,23,26,29,32,36; Jgs. 6:25; Ezk. 46:13; Mic. 6:6).

Ex. 23:10-11 requires that after six years of cultivation, the seventh year is to be a fallow year. In Lev. 25:3-5 the same institution is called a "sabbath of rest," a "sabbath for Yahweh," and a "year of complete rest" (*šᵉnaṯ šabbāṯôn*), the so-called Sabbatical Year.[103] Lev. 25:8 requires that seven sabbaths (= weeks) of years be counted, seven times seven years. The fiftieth year (vv. 10-11; secondary) is called a Jubilee or Jubilee Year (→ יובל *yôḇēl*) in vv. 10-13. Vv. 15-16 contain detailed regulations governing the purchase and sale of real estate; the price must take into account the number of years since the Jubilee or the number of remaining crop years (*šᵉnê-ṯᵉḇû'ōṯ*). Further details are spelled out in vv. 20-22,25-34 (with the formula *ʿaḏ-tōm šᵉnam mimkar*, "until a year has elapsed since the sale," in v. 29),39-43,47-55.[104]

---

95. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1969), 383.

96. See W. Beuken, → XIII, 256, for a different interpretation.

97. See *BHS*.

98. *GesB*, 311; E. Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 563; Kutsch, *ZAW* 83; Auerbach, *VT* 3.

99. *KBL*², 393; *AncIsr*, I, 190; II, 471; M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1964), 191; Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 62.

100. *AncIsr*, I, 190; cf. Y. Avishur, *Stylistic Studies of Word Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures. AOAT* 210 (1984), 184, 408-9.

101. H. W. Hertzberg, *Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* IX (⁴1969), 217-18.

102. M. Noth, *Könige I: 1.Kön. 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 220.

103. → שׁבת *šabbāṯ*.

104. For a literary analysis of Lev. 25, see K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 335-49.

Lev. 27:16-24 deals with the consecration of real estate to Yahweh and its redemption, with the Jubilee Year as the reference point.[105]

The seventh year as a fallow year also appears in Dt. 15:1,9; the context (vv. 1-11) reinterprets the fallow year as a total remission of debts *(šᵉmiṭṭâ).* Dt. 31:10-11 provides for a public reading of the *tôrâ* of Yahweh during this year. Ezk. 46:17 speaks of the year of liberty *(šᵉnaṯ haddᵉrôr);* Neh. 10:32(31) speaks of forgoing the crops and the exaction of debts every seventh year.[106]

A number of texts state the age at which people assume certain ritual or legal obligations (Ex. 30:14; 38:26; Lev. 27:3-7; Nu. 1:3-45; 26:2,4 [cf. 14:29; 32:11]; 1 Ch. 27:23; 2 Ch. 25:5). Age limits for service in the sanctuary are given in Nu. 4:3,23,30,35, 39,43,47; 8:24-25; 1 Ch. 23:3,24,27; Ezr. 3:8. The lists of cultic personnel included among the priests all males from three years old and upward (2 Ch. 31:16) and among the Levites those from twenty years old and upward (v. 17).

The slavery law of the Covenant Code decrees that a male Hebrew slave is to serve for seven years; in the seventh year he is to go out free (Ex. 21:2; cf. Dt. 15:12,18; Jer. 34:14 [though according to Sarna Jer. 34:14 relates to the Sabbatical Year[107]]).

Lev. 19:23-25 and Dt. 14:22,28 regulate certain periods of time to be observed before eating the fruit of a newly planted fruit tree and in setting apart tithes from the harvest, for which Dt. 26:12 uses the term "year of the tithe" *(šᵉnaṯ hammaʿᵃśēr).* Dt. 24:5 contains a humanitarian law allowing a newly married man to be exempt for a year from military service and other obligations.

4. *Anthropological and Theological Significance.* The very first occurrence of *šānâ* in a non-Priestly context is of great anthropological significance. Gen. 6:3 is a J interpolation into the mythological fragment 6:1-2,4,[108] recording Yahweh's reaction to the union between the sons of God and the daughters of humans: he limits the human life span to 120 years. "Behind the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men there is the instinct to prolong and secure life. And so the . . . divine judgment [has] the same meaning: a person is thrown back within the bounds that one has overstepped and one's life-span is limited."[109] This limitation, furthermore, clearly conflicts with the ages recorded by P (cf. merely Gen. 25:7,17).

In P contexts we frequently meet the determinative expression *šᵉnê ḥayyîm,* "years of life," which qualifies the years of a human life as being "full" (cf. Gen. 25:8[110]): Gen. 25:7,17; 47:28; Ex. 6:16,18,20; cf. 2 S. 19:35. This expression functions virtu-

---

105. For a literary analysis see ibid., 380-85.

106. *BHS;* A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 134-35; on the whole subject see Kutsch, *RGG*³, II, 568-69; III, 799-800; D. Correns, *BHHW,* I, 429-30; II, 868; III, 1635-36; F. Horst, *Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im AT. ThB* 12 (1961), 79-89, 213-19; A. Alt, *KlSchr,* I (1953), 327-28; R. North, → III, 265-69; idem, → VI, 1-6; Elliger, *Leviticus,* 349-54.

107. P. 149.

108. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 366, 368-69.

109. Ibid., 376.

110. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen,* 148.

ally as a leitmotif in the dialogue between Pharaoh and Jacob (Gen. 47:8 [P]).[111] After Pharaoh asks Jacob about the "days of the years of [his] life," the patriarch responds: "The days of the years of my sojourn *(šᵉnê māḡûray)* are 130 years: few and hard have been the days of the years of my life, and they do not compare with the days of the years of life of my fathers." When the years of Jacob's life are described as few and hard to boot, this means that a lifetime should be expected to be long and good. The phrase "years of my sojourn" alludes to the fact that Jacob possesses no land of his own.

That human life consists of a sequence of years is made clear by the imperative in Isa. 29:1: *šᵉpû šānâ ʿal-šānâ,* "add year to year." The parallel stich, "let the festivals run their round," shows that an ideal lifetime should be a string of festivals, happy and fulfilled — a sarcastic statement in the context.[112] A full life is also at the core of Isa. 65:20, in a context that foretells eschatological joy and happiness for Jerusalem: "One who dies at a hundred years will be considered a youth, and one who falls short of a hundred will be considered accursed."

In an oracle of judgment against Jerusalem, Ezk. 22:4 says that through its guilt the city has brought on its appointed time, i.e., the end of its years;[113] it has lost its chance for a full life and faces disaster.

Hab. 3:2 says that in the midst of the years *(bᵉqereḇ šānîm)* Yahweh will give life to his work, i.e., bring it to pass, revealing himself.[114] In the light of 2:3, "in the midst of the years" probably means that Yahweh "will fulfill his work in the years between the present and the time he has appointed."[115] The prophet prays that Yahweh will shorten the waiting period.

In Isa. 61:2 a prophet says that Yahweh has sent him "to proclaim a year of Yahweh's favor *(šᵉnaṯ-rāṣôn).*" The point is the dawning of a new age, which will be marked, among other things, by the release *(dᵉrôr)* of prisoners (v. 1). This promise probably alludes to the Jubilee Year, which is characterized by the release of Israelite slaves (Lev. 25:10). Thus Isa. 61:2 proclaims the good news of the release of Israel's deportees — albeit reinterpreted and spiritualized as a message of comfort and support for the people in the land during the postexilic period, whom the problems of reconstruction threaten to overwhelm.[116]

The noun *šānâ* takes on special anthropological weight in the prayers and thanksgivings of the individual. Hezekiah laments that he must go down to the netherworld in the midst of his days, bereft of the rest of his years (Isa. 38:10). If the emendation *ʾōḏeḵā* in Isa. 38:15b[117] is correct, the verse would read: ". . . I will praise you all

111. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 167.

112. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 73-74.

113. On the text see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 452-53.

114. *BHS;* K. Elliger, *Zwolf Kleinen Propheten II. ATD* XXV (^{7}1975), 49; W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakkuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 133.

115. Rudolph, *Habakkuk,* 242.

116. Zimmerli, *Studien,* 225-28.

117. Proposed by Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 440-41.

my years." This would characterize the human lifetime in its full temporal extent as the place where Yahweh's praise resounds.

In Ps. 31:11(10) the psalmist's years are spent with sighing. Ps. 90:9-10 observes that our years come to an end like a sigh, that our years are 70 in number, or at most 80[118] — the consequence of God's anger at human wickedness;[119] cf. 78:33. And so 90:15 prays that Yahweh may bestow gladness "for as many years as we have seen evil." Conversely, the speaker of 77:6(5) remembers in the midst of affliction the "years of long ago" (*šᵉnôṯ ʿôlāmîm*[120]), meaning a time in the long distant past, perceived as felicitous. What 90:15 hopes that the future will bring, 77:6(5) projects into the distant past.[121]

Also to the category of lament belongs Job's wish (Job 3:6) that the day of his birth not join the company of the days of the year.[122] "Thus Job would slip the ties of creation, maneuvering to burst the chains that bind him to his existence."[123]

A psalm for the king prays: "May his years endure as the days[124] from generation to generation" (Ps. 61:7[6]). These words ask not just that the king may live a long life but also that he may enjoy the presence of Yahweh, "whose omnipresence is without beginning, without extension, and without end."[125] The psalmist confesses to Yahweh: "Your years endure from generation to generation" (102:25[24]), and: "Your years do not come to an end" (*tmm*, v. 28[27][126]). The presence of Yahweh, which transcends all temporal limits, is well expressed in 90:4: "For a thousand years in your sight are like yesterday — it is past like a watch in the night."[127]

The text of 90:5 is difficult. A probable reading is: "You seed them [human beings] year after year; they are like the grass, which grows up afresh."[128] "God's eternity . . . and human time are in the final analysis incommensurable."[129] In 65:12(11), with reference to the human world, the psalmist says that Yahweh crowns the year with his bounty *(šᵉnaṯ ṭôḇāṯeḵā)*, probably a motif of harvest thanksgiving.

Wisdom, too, is concerned with the phenomenon of time. Job 15:20 speaks of the number of years laid up for the ruthless. "For all the years that God . . . has appointed for him to live, he is tormented by fear of the end he sees approaching."[130] Job 32:7 asks, "Let many years teach wisdom." In other words, only those who are advanced in years possess the gift of wisdom — a traditional view that Elihu nevertheless questions

---

118. Cf. *BHS;* H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 213-14.
119. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 216.
120. On the text see ibid., 113.
121. M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (Eng. tr. 1958, repr. Lincoln, 1996), 392-94.
122. *BHS;* Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 110.
123. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 117.
124. Cf. *BHS;* Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 7-8.
125. H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. FRLANT* 148 (1989), 213, on Ps. 21:5(4).
126. J. C. de Moor, *UF* 1 (1969) 179.
127. See *BHS.*
128. Cf. *BHS;* Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 212-13.
129. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 216.
130. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 273.

(vv. 8-10). Conventional wisdom is also the source of the statement that those who serve God complete their years in pleasantness (36:11).[131]

In a rhetorical question Job asks of God: "Are your years like the days of a mortal?" — are you not behaving just like a mortal in seeking out my iniquity? Of himself, Job is forced to observe that there are only "years of number" *(šᵉnôṯ mispār),* i.e., a few years, until he must go the way from which he will not return (16:22). The number of God's years, on the other hand, is unsearchable (*lō'-ḥeqqer,* 36:26). This amounts to "a fundamental and universal observation: before God, none was, and after God, none will be."[132]

Eccl. 6:3 puts a critical question to longevity: "If one lives many years and the days of his years are truly many, but his throat is not filled with life's good things — even if a grave were not awaiting him — I say that a stillborn child is better off than he" (cf. 6:6; 11:8; 12:1). This critical attitude of Qoheleth stands in contrast to the optimism of conventional wisdom, which believes that the years of the obedient student will be abundant (Prov. 4:10; cf. 3:2; 9:11), whereas the years of the wicked will be short (10:27; cf. 5:9 [which may, however, involve the root *šnh* III[133]]) — a result of the dependence of consequences on acts, a notion that largely dominates wisdom thought.

Thus *šānâ* points to the temporal dimension of human life — positively as abundance, negatively as a boundary. Yahweh, however, is exempt from all temporality, transcending all time.

IV. Deuterocanonical Books. In the deuterocanonical books the most common word for "year" is *étos.* The noun appears in the context of dates, time spans, or ages in Tob. 1:7-8 (S = Sinaiticus); 2:10 (S); 5:3 (S); 14:2; 14:11 (A [= Alexandrinus], B [= Vaticanus]); 14:14 (A, S, R [= Vetus Latina]); Jth. 1:1,13; 2:1; 8:4; 16:23; Est. 1:1a; 10:31; Sir. Prologue 27; Bar. 1:2; 6:2 (= Letter of Jeremiah); 1 Mc. 1:7,9-10,20,29,54; 2:70; 3:37; 4:52; 6:16,20; 7:1; 9:3,54,57; 10:1,21,41-42,57,67; 11:19; 13:41,51; 14:1,27; 15:10; 16:3,14; 2 Mc. 1:7,9,20; 11:3,21,33,38; 13:1; 14:4. Of special interest are 1 Mc. 6:53 (cf. v. 49), which speaks of the seventh year as a fallow year; 13:42, which describes the introduction of the era of Simon as high priest; and 2 Mc. 7:27, which speaks of nursing a child for three years.

Only a few passages are of anthropological importance. Among them, Wis. 4:8 states that an honorable age is not measured in years — a common theme in ancient literature. "It is not the number of one's years that determines the worth of one's life, but the endeavor to make the best of one's allotted span."[134] Sir. 18:9-10 observes that the number of days in a human life may make up many years, as many as a hundred, but this amounts to very few from the perspective of eternity. Sir. 26:2 states that the husband of a loyal wife will complete his years in peace *(en eirḗnę̄).*[135] Sir. 41:4 (H = He-

131. Secondary according to ibid., 473.
132. Ibid., 478.
133. J. A. Emerton, *VT* 24 (1974) 26.
134. A. Schmitt, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Würzburg, 1986), 66.
135. But see G. Sauer, "Jesus Sirach," *JSHRZ* III (1981), 568-69.

brew) speaks of death as the lot of all mortals: "Whether a thousand years, a hundred, or ten — in the netherworld there are no questions asked."

The noun *eniautós* appears in Tob. 1:7 (B, A, S); Dnl. 13:5; 1 Mc. 3:28; 4:28,59 (referring to the annual celebration of Hanukkah);[136] 7:49; 8:4,16; 10:40,42; 11:34; 13:52; 2 Mc. 10:8 (cf. 1 Mc. 4:59). Wis. 7:19 speaks of the "cycle of the year" (B, S^c: "of the years"); Sir. 33:7 observes that the daylight of the year comes from the sun. The noun *alloíōsis* occurs in Sir. 37:17 and 43:8.

The Seleucids introduced an autumnal calendar in Antioch and the Macedonian colonies, whereas in Mesopotamia they adopted the vernal calendar used also by the Jews.[137] The Syro-Macedonian chronology is used by 1 Maccabees to date events of general history. For dates immediately affecting the Jewish community it keeps the Mesopotamian chronology, which is also followed by 2 Maccabees, except in the foreign documents cited in 2 Mc. 11.[138]

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the noun *šnh* appears primarily in stereotyped idioms such as *šnh bšnh,* "year after year" (1QpHab 6:7; 1QS 2:19; 5:24; 1QM 2:8; 5Q13 1 12[?]; 5Q13 4 4); *brw'š šnym,* "at the beginning of the years" (1QS 10:6); *mw'dy šnym,* "the fixed times of the year" (1QS 10:7; cf. 4Q511 2 1:9: *mw'dy šnh*); *kwl ymy hšnh,* "all the days of the year" (1QM 2:4); *tqwpwt šnym,* "cycle of the years" (1QM 10:15; cf. 1QH 1:24); *kwl šny nṣḥ/'wlm,* "all the years of eternity" (1QH 1:19; 1QH fr. 11:2; CD 2:10; cf. 4Q504 1-2 3:7: *šny dwrwt*); *'d šnh tmymh,* "up to a full year" (CD 15:15). Dates, spans of time, and ages are found in 1QM 2:4,6,9-14 (//4QM^f 5-6 1; 13:3); 6:14; 7:1-3; 4QM^a 4:2; 11QT 14:9-10 (cf. Nu. 29:1-3);[139] 15:2; 17:8(age limit for celebrating Passover; cf. Jub. 49:17),13; 20:2; 22:3; 25:13; 28:10 (the age of sacrificial animals); 57:3 (cf. (Lev. 27:3); 63:15 (more strict than Dt. 21:10-14); plus some 25 times in the Murabba'at texts. The year of release *(šnt hšmyṭṭh)* is discussed in 1QM 2:6-9 (cf. 1Q22 3:1-8), the Jubilee Year *(šnt hywbl)* in 11QMelch 2:2, and the "year of grace" *(šnt hrṣwn)* in 11QMelch 2:9. The year of Israel's departure from Egypt appears in 1Q22 1:1 (cf. also 1Q22 4:7,10-11; 1Q42 3).

The Manual of Discipline requires "the Many" to keep vigil for a third of all the nights of the year in order to read the book and study the law (1QS 6:7). Periods of time in the reception of members into the community, membership in the council, expulsion, and other punishments are mentioned in 1QS 6:17-18,21,25,27; 7:2,4,8,16,19-21,22-24; 8:10,25-27; 9:1-2.

The Rule of the Congregation provides for ten years of instruction in the precepts of the covenant; membership in the community is possible at the age of twenty (1QSa 1:8). The same age is required for sexual intercourse with a woman (1QSa 1:10). Additional references to years of age appear in 1QSa 1:12-13,19.

---

136. W. Dommershausen, *1/2 Makkabäer. NEB* (1985), 38-39.

137. For a general presentation of the Greek and Macedonian calendar, see Finegan, 57-73; and VanderKam.

138. *AncIsr,* I, 192; Schaumberger, 434.

139. J. Maier, *Temple Scroll. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. tr. 1985), 77.

The beginning of the Damascus Document speaks of 390 years of wrath after God delivered Israel into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (CD 1:5). Lohse notes that this number cannot be used to calculate the date when the Essene community was founded — "what we have here is an apocalyptic number (cf. Ezk. 4:5) intended to demonstrate that the eschaton is at hand."[140] The period from the beginning of the community until the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness is identified as twenty years (CD 1:10-11).[141] Age limits for judges, priests, and overseers are in CD 10:6-8 (cf. 1QSa 1:12-18 and Lev. 27:7). The duration of certain punitive measures is the subject of CD 12:5 and 14:22 (cf. 1QS 6:26–7:25). "Years of existence" *(šny m'md)* are mentioned in CD 2:9, "years of their exile" *(šny htgwrm)* in CD 4:5 (cf. also CD 4:9-10,12; 1Q36 11 2). The time from the day when "the teacher of the community was taken away until the destruction of all the men of war who turned back with the man of lies" will be forty years (CD 20:14-15; cf. 4QpPs37 2:7-8).

The Qumran community had its own calendar.[142] The year comprises 52 complete weeks (364 days); the festivals always fall on the same day of the week (1QS 10:1-8; cf. 11QPs^a 27:6; Jub. 6:23-32; 1 En. 22:7-32; 82:10-18). The chronological system of the book of Jubilees, followed by Qumran, is based on the jubilee cycle of 49 years (Jub. 45:13; 1QS 10:8).[143]

Stendebach

140. Lohse, 287.
141. Ibid.
142. Finegan, 44-49; Baumgarten; Davies.
143. Kutsch, *RGG*³, III, 799-800; Wacholder.

שָׁנִי *šānî*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Related Terms. III. Manufacture. IV. 1. Range of Meanings; 2. Secular Usage; 3. Cultic Usage. V. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šānî. A. Brenner, *Colour Terms in the OT. JSOTSup* 21 (1982), esp. 143-45; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 362; G. Dalman, *AuS*, V (1937), esp. 84-85; F. Delitzsch, "Farben in der Bibel," *RE*³, V, 755-62, esp. 756-59; R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963); J. M. Grintz, "שָׁנִי," *Leš* 39 (1974/75) 174-78; H. W. Hönig, "Die Bekleidung des Hebräers" (diss., Zurich, 1957), esp. 129; O. Michel, "κόκκινος," *TDNT*, III, 812-14; C. L. Wickwire, "Scarlet," *IDB*, IV, 233-34.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The etymology and meaning of *šānî* are uncertain (= "luster"?),[1] but there are ancient cognates in Akkadian (*šinītu*[*m*] II, "dyed fabric")[2] and Ugaritic.[3] We also learn from the Nuzi texts that in the 15/14th century B.C.E. "rouge extracts from worms" were imported from Phoenicia. This information fits with the statement in 2 Ch. 2:6,13(Eng. 7,14) that Solomon summoned Phoenician artisans to work with the dye, here called *karmîl.*[4]

II. Related Terms. The noun *šānî* occurs 43 times in the OT (including Sirach). It is used absolutely 9 times; otherwise it appears in combination with *tôla'aṯ* as *tôla'aṯ šānî* or *šᵉnî tôla'aṯ.*[5] The difference depends on the usage of the word: absolutely, *šānî* denotes scarlet fabrics in secular usage;[6] the combination with *tôla'aṯ* suggests the source of the dye, which is of special significance in cultic contexts.[7]

The association of *tôla'aṯ* with *šānî* may explain the noun *tôlā',* "(crimson) worm dye" = "crimson,"[8] which parallels *šānî* in Isa. 1:18 and is used absolutely in Lam. 4:5. The participial formation *mᵉṯullā'îm,* "warriors clothed in crimson," appears in Nah. 2:4(3).

In the later period (2 Ch. 2:6,13[7,14]; 3:14), the same color is called *karmîl,* a loanword from Sanskrit, which by way of Arab. *qirmizî* led to the modern word "crimson" and the botanical term "kermes," as in "kermes oak."[9]

Besides the deep red dye denoted by this word,[10] the OT speaks of the darker violet or purple dye obtained from the Murex snail *(tᵉḵēleṯ; 'argāmān).*[11]

III. Manufacture. The dye called *(tôla'aṯ) šānî* is a pigment derived from the kermes shield louse (*Kermes vermilio* and *Kermes ilicis;* family *Kermidae*),[12] a scale insect that lives on the shrubby kermes oak *(Quercus coccifera),* native to southern Europe and the Near East. Adult females, about the shape and size of a pea, each bearing 1800-2600 eggs, were collected at the end of winter, killed with vinegar, and then dried. In this form ("crimson berries") they were used in dyeing.[13]

---

1. *HAL,* II, 1603; Gradwohl, 73.
2. *AHw,* III, 1242.
3. *WUS,* no. 2894.
4. See II below; cf. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden, 1960), 157; Gradwohl, 74.
5. *GesB,* 873; *HAL,* II, 1603.
6. See IV.2 below.
7. Dalman, 84-85.
8. *HAL,* II, 1603.
9. See III below; cf. *HAL,* I, 498-99; similarly Delitzsch, 757-58.
10. Dalman, 85: "bright, vivid"; Delitzsch, 757: "bright red"; Gradwohl, 73: "brilliant."
11. Dalman, 78-84; Gradwohl, 66-73.
12. See also M.-L. Henry, *BHHW,* III, 1685-86.
13. Delitzsch, 757-58; F. N. Hepper, *Pflanzenwelt der Bibel* (Stuttgart, 1992), 170; Gradwohl, 73-74; E. Unger, *RLA,* III, 26-27; on the process of dyeing see Dalman, 76-78; D. Irvin, *BRL²,* 73-74.

IV. 1. *Range of Meanings.* Although *šānî* is primarily a term denoting the color crimson or scarlet (Isa. 1:18: *šānî, 'dm* hiphil, *tôlā',* in contrast to *lbn* hiphil, *šeleg, ṣemer* ["undyed = white wool"]), it can also denote textiles of this color in both secular and cultic use, such as clothing (Ex. 28:4-5, etc.; Jer. 4:30; similarly *m^{e}ṯullā'* in Nah. 2:4[3]), curtains and coverings (Ex. 26:1, etc.; Lam. 4:5), or threads and cords (Gen. 38:28,30; Josh. 2:18-21).

According to Gradwohl,[14] apotropaic power was frequently ascribed to this color (Gen. 38:28; Josh. 2:18; Nah. 2:4; Cant. 4:3; also Lev. 14:4-9; Nu. 19:6), and perhaps also a psychological effect (Jer. 4:30: "arouse"; Nah. 2:4[3]: "frighten"[15]).

2. *Secular Usage.* The phrase *tiqwaṯ ḥûṭ haššānî* in Josh. 2:18,21 clearly denotes a cord made of individual crimson fibers (cf. Eccl. 4:12, a threefold cord). For Gen. 38:28,30, the meaning of *šānî* must be determined from the context: at the birth of twins, a crimson thread is used to mark the firstborn. Here the color may also be related to the child's name: *zeraḥ* recalls the red of sunrise *(mizrāḥ).*[16] According to Gradwohl,[17] the original purpose was to avert the influence of demons; the naming is a later interpretation from a time that no longer understood the magical significance of the act.

In 2 S. 1:24 and Jer. 4:30, *šānî* is the color of expensive women's clothing that is probably also fashionable and provocative. Cant. 4:3 compares the bride's lips to a crimson thread.

The reading *šānîm* in Prov. 31:21 is disputed. The context suggests warm garments of double thickness (reading *š^{e}nāyim* with LXX and Vg.), which protect the members of the household in winter. Plöger combines the two readings into "scarlet (wool)."[18]

3. *Cultic Usage.* Together with violet and purple textiles, crimson fabrics play a large part in the priestly vestments of Aaron and the design of the tabernacle. In Ex. 25:3-4 and 35:5-6 Moses requests an offering of violet, purple, and crimson (already described in 35:25 as dyed yarn ready for weaving), along with gold, silver, copper, and byssus. The colors appear again in the description of the curtains and coverings for the tabernacle (26:1,31,36; 27:16), and then in the description of the individual elements of the priestly vestments (28:4-6,8,15,31-33). The account of the making of these vestments uses the same words (39:1-5,8,24,29), as well as the making of the coverings for the tabernacle (36:35,37; 38:18). According to Nu. 4:8, the table with the bread of the Presence is also covered with a crimson cloth.[19] Between the description and the actual manufacture, the names of the men who made these textiles are given

14. Pp. 74-78.
15. P. 76.
16. Dalman, 85.
17. Pp. 74-75.
18. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 370, 372; similarly A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16/2 (1991), 526.
19. → בגד *beg̱eḏ.*

(Ex. 35:34-35; 36:8; 38:23). The description of Aaron as high priest and his vestments in Sir. 45 mentions a crimson sash, the work of a weaver (v. 11). A similar passage in 1QM 7:9-11 describes the vestments of the "seven priests of the sons of Aaron."[20]

Besides the dyeing of textiles for vestments or curtains and coverings, *šānî* appears in purification ceremonies (Lev. 14:4,6,49,51-52; Nu. 19:6), clearly because this dye, like hyssop, was thought to have apotropaic power.[21] According to Elliger, this usage suggests an early origin, possibly Canaanite.[22] The dye is clearly a component of the water of purification,[23] "to augment the lustral efficacy of the sacrificial action."[24]

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX varies considerably in its translation of *šānî* (with or without *tôla'aṯ*[25]). In some instances we find simply *kókkinos* (Gen. 38:28,30; Ex. 35:25; Nu. 4:8; 19:6; Josh. 2:18; 2 S. 1:24; Jer. 4:30; Cant. 4:3), which accords with the shift of *tôlē'â*, "worm," to *tôlā'*, "crimson."[26]

Twice we find *kókkinos diploús* (Ex. 25:4; 35:6), a translation that connects *šānî* with the numerical *šᵉnayim*. Carmine thread that has been woven into cloth is called *kókkinos keklōsménos* (Ex. 26:1, etc.), *kókkinos nenēsménos/dianenēsménos* (Ex. 36:9, etc.; 28:8, etc.). In Lev. 14 we find *keklōsménos kókkinos* (vv. 4,49,51) and *klōstós kókkinos* (v. 6).

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* To date, only two occurrences of *šānî* have been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QM 7:11; 4Q525 2 3:6), each in combination with → **תולעת** *tôla'aṯ*.

Beyse

20. See V.2 below.
21. See IV.1 above.
22. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 187.
23. Ibid.
24. Gradwohl, 77.
25. See II above.
26. See II above.

שָׁנַן *šānan;* שְׁנִינָה *šᵉnînâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. *šānan* II. II. Usage: 1. Verb; 2. Noun. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The supposed Akkadian parallel *lišninu* in l. 21 of Taanach letter 2 is illusory.[1] The correct reading[2] is *lim-ni-nu.*[3] In Arabic we find *sanna,* "sharpen, whet, polish," and *'asanna* IV, "get teeth."[4] Jewish Aramaic[5] and Syriac[6] have the adj. *šᵉnîn,* "sharpened, pointed"; cf. also *šᵉnānā',* "blade." It is interesting that for Ethiopic Leslau cites two lemmata *sanana,* both of which are taken from native lexicons that list them without specific citations: *sanana* I, "sharpen" (possibly a denominative from *sĕnn,* "tooth"), and *sanana* II, "get teeth" (denominative from *sĕnn*).[7] Eth. *tasnān,* "quarrel," has related forms in Tigriña, Argobba, and Gurage. Some lexicons[8] consider Heb. *šānan* to be a possible denominative from → שֵׁן *šēn,* "tooth"; others[9] consider the verb primary. The primacy of the verbal form *šānan* appears to be supported also by the corresponding Mehri form *hᵉn* (root *hnn*), "whet, sharpen,"[10] since the sound shift *š* > *h* argues an early date.[11]

2. *Occurrences.* The vb. *šānan* qal occurs 7 times in the OT: 4 in the Psalms, plus Dt. 32:41; Isa. 5:28; Prov. 25:18. The pass. ptcp. *šānûn/šᵉnûnîm* appears 4 times. A hithpolel[12] *'eštônān* in the metaphorical sense of "be indignant" appears in Ps. 73:21 ("I felt a sharp stab in my kidneys [NRSV: heart]").[13] The derived noun *šᵉnînâ,* "taunt, derision," occurs 4 times (Dt. 28:37; 1 K. 9:7; Jer. 24:9; 2 Ch. 7:20); it probably reflects the metaphor of speaking with a "sharpened" tongue ("barbed words").[14] In Dt. 32:41 some SP mss. read *śn'ynh,* presumably from the root *śn',* "hate."

3. *šānan II.* The piel *wᵉšinnantām* in Dt. 6:7 has been derived from *šānan* I, with the meaning "incise, engrave" (by incessant recitation and explanation).[15] The LXX

1. *GesB,* 852.
2. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 94 (1944) 18.
3. On *šnn* in *AP* 15.16 see P. Grelot, *RB* 78 (1971) 534-36.
4. Wehr, 433.
5. Jastrow, 1607.
6. *LexSyr,* 789.
7. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 507.
8. *BDB,* 1041-42; *HAL,* II, 1606.
9. *GesB,* 852; *KBL*[1], 998; König, 518; *LexHebAram,* 869.
10. T. M. Johnstone, *Mehri Lexicon* (London, 1987), 158.
11. Reference from W. W. Müller.
12. Bergsträsser, II, §§20d, 28v.
13. See also B. Kedar-Kopfstein, *ZAH* 1 (1988) 157; Y. Avishur, *Leš* 44 (1980) 263-67.
14. See the translation of Dt. 28:37 by E. König, *Deuteronomium. KAT* III (1917), 191; also Kedar-Kopfstein, 150-51.
15. C. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium. HKAT* I/3.1 (²1923), 76.

probibáseis and Vg. *narrabis* could not divert Luther from the meaning "sharpen"; his 1545 translation reads *und solt sie deinen Kindern scherffen* ("and sharpen them for your children") with a lengthy note on *scherffen* ("practice constantly").

Driver proposes instead to treat *šinnēn* as a by-form of *šānâ,* "do again, repeat."[16] He cites Aquila *(deuterṓseis)* and Syr. *tn',* as well as Ugar. *ṯnnth.*[17] The context of the latter is not preserved, but its meaning is delimited by *ṯlṯth* in the following line; Driver[18] translates: "she did it a second time."[19] Jenni accepts Driver's interpretation with a modification, claiming that *šnn* piel means "constant repetition — not denoting the concrete performance of successive actions, which are carried out a second time only figuratively, but summarizing them in a resultative."[20] The point is that the important theological statement in Dt. 6:4 is to be learned "in the typical manner of the ancient Near East: the teacher pronounces the text and the learners repeat it; this goes on until it is firmly fixed in memory. It is quoted always and everywhere. Thus the younger generation is socialized by meditating together with their elders on the texts of their faith."[21]

This vb. *šnn* II piel appears also as a variant to *spr* in the Masada text of Sir. 42:15: "And what I have seen, I will constantly repeat" — probably an allusion to Dt. 6:7. Another allusion to Dt. 6:7 is found in 1QH 4:10, where the hymnist speaks of God's law as being imprinted on his heart *('šr šnnth blbby).*

Kellermann†

II. Usage.

1. *Verb.* In 4 instances the object of *šnn* is "arrow(s)."[22] Naturally flint or metal arrowheads were sharpened. Isa. 5:28 describes the advancing enemy as being armed with sharpened arrows and bent bows. In Ps. 45:6(Eng. 5), the sharpened arrows of the king strike the heart of his enemies.[23] Ps. 120:4, a curse and cry for vengeance, promises to punish the psalmist's enemy with "a warrior's sharpened arrows and glowing coals of the broom tree." Since the context speaks of the lying enemy's deceitful tongue, the arrows are probably meant figuratively: the punishment fits the crime. A sharpened arrow is equated explicitly with deceitful speech in Prov. 25:18: "A club, a sword, a sharp arrow — so is one who bears false witness against a neighbor." Therefore it seems quite natural when two passages in the Psalms speak of sharpening tongues. Ps. 64:4(3) describes the psalmist's enemies: "They sharpen their

16. G. R. Driver, in H. Junker and J. Botterweck, eds., *Alttestamentlicher Studien. FS F. Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950), 48.

17. *KTU* 1.16, V, 8.

18. *CML,* 44-45; followed by *CML²*, 99.

19. Similarly *WUS,* no. 2893.

20. Jenni, *HP,* 274.

21. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium I: 1,1–16,7. NEB* 15 (1986), 57.

22. → חץ *ḥēṣ.*

23. Words transposed following *BHS.*

tongues like swords, they let fly poisonous words like arrows." Ps. 140:4(3) is similar: "They whet their tongues like snakes, the venom of vipers is under their lips." The images speak for themselves. Finally, Dt. 32:41 uses *šnn* with "sword" as its object: "Yahweh whets his flashing sword and takes hold of judgment in his hand." V. 42 goes on to speak of arrows.

Ringgren

2. *Noun.* The noun *šᵉnînâ,* "cutting remarks, derision," always appears in conjunction with → משׁל *māšāl,* used in the sense of "taunt song"; this combination determines its meaning. In the context of curses threatened should people be disobedient, Dt. 28:37 foretells that even in exile Israel will be mocked and scorned by all the peoples: Israel will be a *šammâ,* a *māšāl,* and a *šᵉnînâ.* The same prediction of disaster by a Dtr pen appears in 1 K. 9:7, in the so-called second theophany to Solomon. In the parallel text 2 Ch. 7:20, however, it is no longer Israel but the temple that will be an object of scorn and mockery among all peoples.

In the interpretation of Jeremiah's vision of the two baskets of figs, Jer. 24:9 cites an oracle of judgment against Zedekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, which foretells that they will become a byword and a taunt, a horror, a disgrace, and a curse to all the kingdoms of the earth. The number of expressions in this bombastic verse suggests that some are secondary additions. According to Volz,[24] only *zwʻh* is original, the rest being an intensifying expansion; according to Weippert,[25] the pair *māšāl* and *šᵉnînâ* are a secondary addition.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *šānan* qal 4 times with *akonán,* "sharpen, whet," and once each with *paroxýnein,* "make sharp," *oxýs,* "sharp," and *akidōtós,* "pointed." The Vg. uses *acuero* or *acutus.* The LXX interprets the hithpolel in Ps. 73:21 as a form of *šānâ: alloioún,* "change, alter" (Vg. *commutare*). Twice (Dt. 28:37; 2 Ch. 7:20) the LXX translates *šᵉnînâ* with the colorless *diḗgēma,* "narrative, story"; once (1 K. 9:7) it uses *lálēma,* "chatter." In Jer. 24:9 the LXX reads *śinʼâ,* "hatred." The Vg. uses *fabula* twice, *proverbium* and *exemplum* once each.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The vb. *šnn* occurs 3 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[26] In 1QM 17:1 God is described as sharpening the weapons of his people so that they shall not be blunted. In 1QH 5:13 the speaker praises God for saving the soul of the poor man in the lair of lions, which had sharpened their tongues like swords (cf. Ps. 64:4[3]; 140:4[3]). In a similar vein 4Q184 1 1 describes the wicked woman as sharpening her words *(dbryh).* The noun in 11QT 59:2 reflects Dt. 28:37.

Kellermann†

---

24. P. Volz, *Jeremia. KAT* X (1922), 247 n. 1.
25. H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973), 189 n. 365.
26. See I.3 above on 1QH 4:10.

שָׂסָה *šāsâ;* שָׂסַס *šāsas;* מְשִׁסָּה *m^ešissâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. General and Prophetic Usage. III. Dtr Usage. IV. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* There are two variants of the Hebrew verbal root translated "plunder, spoil": *šāsâ* and *šss.* They probably derive from an original biliteral root **šs* with that meaning.[1] This root was later expanded to *šss* and *šsh (šsy),* both of which appear in the OT. From the latter derives the common ptcp. *šōseh,* from the former, the *m*-prefix noun *m^ešissâ.*[2]

There are no known cognates in other Semitic languages of the ancient Near East. It is unlikely that Middle Heb. *šāsâ* and Jewish Aram. *š^esî,* "hiss, bait,"[3] are related to Biblical Heb. *šāsâ.* Whether Ugar. *tsm,*[4] found only in the Keret Epic,[5] derives from **tsy* or **tss* and is related to Heb. *šsh* must remain an open question in the absence of clear evidence.[6]

There is, however, a striking parallel in Egypt. Starting in the time of Thutmose II (1494-1490 B.C.E.), many Egyptian documents mention the Shasu (Egyp. *šȝsw*).[7] This word denotes an ethnic group, bedouin or seminomads, living in Syria, Palestine, and — especially — southern Transjordan (Seir, Edom). Occasionally, like Proto-Israelite groups, they are found in Egypt.[8] The connection between Heb. **šs* and Egyp. *šȝsw* is undeniable, but their dependence is questionable. Following Müller,[9] Giveon[10] favors a Semitic origin for the verbal root **šs.*

Weippert,[11] following Albright[12] and Lambdin,[13] concludes otherwise. He derives *šȝsw* from Egyp. *šȝś,* "pass through, traverse."[14] Since Egyptian also exhibits a shift "from the ethnic to the vocational,"[15] there is evidence to suggest that the term devel-

---

šāsâ. R. Giveon, *Les Bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens. DMOA* 18 (1971); idem, "Schasu," *LexÄg,* V, 533-35.

1. *GK,* §77a.e.
2. *HAL,* II, 1608.
3. Jastrow, 1608.
4. *UT,* no. 2757.
5. *KTU* 1.16, VI, 47.
6. *HAL,* II, 1608.
7. Collected in Giveon, *Shosou,* 7-216.
8. See, e.g., *TGI*^{3}, 40-41.
9. W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern* (Leipzig, 1893).
10. Giveon, *Shosou,* 262-64.
11. M. Weippert, in A. Kuschke and E. Kutsch, eds., *Archäologie und AT. FS K. Galling* (Tübingen, 1970), 266-67 n. 34.
12. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 89 (1943) 32.
13. T. O. Lambdin, *JAOS* 73 (1953) 155.
14. *WbÄS,* IV^2, 412; also W. Helck, *VT* 15 (1965) 46.
15. Giveon, "Schasu," 534.

oped in Hebrew during the period of the judges on the basis of contacts between the Israelite tribes and their bedouin neighbors, who ravaged Palestine when the occasion presented itself (cf. Jgs. 6:3-5).

2. *Occurrences.* If we count the common participial forms of *šāsâ,* there are 17 occurrences of *šāsâ* and *šāsas* in the OT: 3 in Judges, 3 in 1 Samuel, 1 in 2 Kings, 4 in Isaiah, 2 in Jeremiah, 1 in Hosea, 1 in Zechariah, and 2 in the Psalms. The noun *m^e^šissâ* occurs once in 2 Kings, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, and twice in Isa. 42. The synonyms *bzz, ḥlṣ* piel, and *šll* II, together with their associated nouns, appear in parallel, especially in prophetic oracles.

II. General and Prophetic Usage. The earliest occurrences of the root **šs* go back to the time of David and Solomon. In the story of David's rise, 1 S. 17:53 tells how Israel plundered the camp of the Philistines after David's victory over Goliath. In 1 S. 23:1 we read of a raid on Keilah, probably carried out historically by a band of Habiru. Both events were small-scale incidents. The legitimacy of such raids depends on the viewer's perspective. The militarily superior group — the victors — probably had the right to despoil their enemies of their movable goods. This is particularly clear in many prophetic oracles, beginning toward the end of the 8th century, that foretell judgment or (for the most part) deliverance for Israel; they treat spoliation as a punishment for Israel. Israel's enemies can also be the victims of spoliation at Yahweh's hand.

The early passages mentioned above describe small-scale raids. In the prophetic oracles, however, it is clear that such incursions threaten the economic basis of society. These oracles probably reflect the kind of experiences Israel had in the period of Assyrian and Babylonian hegemony, as described in the campaign accounts of the Assyrian kings.[16]

In several prophetic oracles of judgment, it is Assyria and Babylonia that are despoiled, often as a consequence of their own transgressions. In a lengthy oracle of judgment against Assyria, Isa. 10:13 (emended) describes Assyria's mockery of the enemies it has plundered. Here *šsh* appears to be a stronger expression than *bzz* or *šll.*[17] Assyria is also the subject of Hab. 2:7, which confronts the Assyrians with their own unjust conduct and threatens them with the same fate. In an oracle of judgment against Babylon, Isa. 13:16 (6th century)[18] presents Yahweh himself as the author of the coming judgment, which includes the plundering of houses. Jer. 50:11 (second half of the 6th century) is also directed against the Babylonians, described as *šōsê naḥ^a^lāṯî.*

Two additional passages describing the attack of the nations against Zion can be included among judgment oracles in the broadest sense. Isa. 17:12-14 (presumably late) couples Zion theology with the motif of "God's help in the morning."[19] A final instance of this group is found in Zech. 14:2. The motif of the attack of the nations also appears

16. *ANET,* 274-317.

17. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 421.

18. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 12.

19. B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils. WMANT* 59 (1989).

in this oracle, which borrows from Isa. 13:16. Jerusalem itself is despoiled initially, but finally experiences deliverance after this act of judgment — a clear reminiscence of past history.

The sufferings of the helpless populace despoiled by the great powers, especially during the last days of the southern kingdom, are depicted by several laments that describe these events retrospectively. Whether the prophet Deutero-Isaiah, living in exile, draws on 2 K. 17 (Dtr),[20] as suggested by Veijola,[21] is dubious at best, in view of the geographical distance between Deutero-Isaiah and the Dtr school. In the context of a salvation oracle, Isa. 42:22,24 lament the desperate situation of the exiles. The catastrophe of 589 B.C.E. was so overwhelming that Israel (Jacob) can be called *'am-bāzûz wᵉšāsûy,* "a people robbed and plundered." The prophet asks who is responsible for this disaster, and then answers immediately in the spirit of Deutero-Isaianic theology: Yahweh himself. The description of the people's affliction of Ps. 44:11(10) also considers Yahweh to be the ultimate author of the disaster, thus helping surmount the crisis.

Jer. 30:16 (emended), in an oracle dating from the prophet's early period, proclaims salvation for the northern kingdom by way of retribution. Hosea, by contrast, proclaims God's judgment upon Ephraim: in 13:15 Shalmaneser V is the agent of this judgment, despoiling Israel of its economic base.[22] Finally, Zeph. 1:13 also presents an oracle against Judah. Plunder goes hand in hand with the threatened devastation of the countryside.

III. Dtr Usage. Drawing in part on prophetic usage, the Dtr school also uses the root **šs*. In Jgs. 2:11-19 the Deuteronomist lays out a programmatic survey of the period of the judges.[23] In this schema Yahweh responds to Israel's repeated apostasy by giving the people over[24] to their enemies, referred to as "plunderers." When the people cry out to Yahweh, he delivers[25] his people from these "plunderer."

Whether 1 S. 14:48 is Dtr is disputed. The wording clearly argues that it is,[26] but not the content.[27] Since the collective use of *šōsîm* is probably late, the decision may well favor a Dtr origin. Why should the Deuteronomist not summarize at least Saul's military victories in a positive light?

The Deuteronomist summarizes the history of the northern kingdom in 2 K. 17. Recalling the period of the judges, v. 20 says that Yahweh gave Israel into the hand of its "plunderers." Here too we see the notion that the exile of the northern kingdom in 722

20. See III below.

21. T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise. AnAcScFen* B 220 (1982), 104.

22. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 167.

23. Noth, *DH,* 19.

24. → נתן *ntn.*

25. → ישׁע *yš'.*

26. T. Veijola, *Der Königtum in der Beurteilung dem deuteronomistischen Historiographie. AnAcScFen* B 198 (1977), 79-82; R. Klein, *1 Samuel. WBC* 10 (1983), 134, 141.

27. Noth, *DH,* 87.

B.C.E. was brought about by Yahweh. In 1 K. 21:10-15 the Deuteronomist "quotes" the message of "Yahweh's servants the prophets," who are said to have foretold the doom of Judah on account of Manasseh's conduct. The southern kingdom — according to these unnamed prophets who keep appearing in the Deuteronomist's schema — will experience the same fate that the northern kingdom experienced a good 130 years previously (v. 14).

Ps. 89 stands apart. Here the Dtr theology of history finds expression in a poetic work.[28] V. 42(41) describes the state of Jerusalem after 589 B.C.E.: it lies defenseless, exposed to all who pass by and "plunder" whatever is left.[29]

IV. LXX. The LXX uses a great variety of translations for *šāsâ/šāsas,* without any discernible system. Verbs are sometimes represented by nouns and vice versa. The actual words used are: *diarpázein/diarpagḗ, katapateín, kataxēraínein,* and *pronomeúein/ pronomḗ.*

The root has not been found to date in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Mommer

28. For a discussion of the whole psalm see Veijola, *Verheissung.*
29. Ibid., 103-10.

שָׁעָה *šā'â*

I. 1. Etymology, Meaning, Occurrences; 2. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. II. Literal Usage. III. Theological Usage: 1. Divine Attention; 2. Human Regard.

I. 1. *Etymology, Meaning, Occurrences.* The Hebrew root *šā'â,* with the basic meaning "look, regard," is comparable to Akk. *še'û(m),* "see, seek (esp. help), pay attention to."[1] The Ugaritic root *ṯ'y,* "look through, verify,"[2] "collate,"[3] has been identified as a

šā'â. L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 210-11.

1. *AHw,* III, 1222-24.
2. *WUS,* no. 2908.
3. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *UF* 5 (1973) 116-17.

cognate of Heb. *šāʿâ*,[4] but the three occurrences cited[5] are still uncertain.[6] Kopf,[7] citing Arab. *saʿâ*, "move rapidly, run, strive toward,"[8] identifies the basic meaning of the Hebrew verb as "strive for," which with various prepositions develops into "try hard to obtain something," and with *min* takes on the opposite sense, "avoid." Citing Isa. 32:3, Kopf explains the commonly given meaning as an idiom with *ʿayin* ("eye") as subject: "the eye strives for something."

The vb. *šāʿâ* denotes a concentrated, intense, and sometimes apprehensive act of looking. The qal occurs 12 times, with the meaning "stare at, pay attention to, take care of, regard." The single instance of the hiphil (Ps. 39:14[Eng. 13]) means "turn one's gaze (away)"; the 2 occurrences of the hithpael (Isa. 41:10,23) mean "look about apprehensively" or "be awe-struck."[9]

2. *LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.* The LXX uses several different verbs to translate *šāʿâ;* the choice is determined in large measure by the context and, in poetry, by parallelism. Only in Gen. 4:4 (but not v. 5) does the LXX use *epideín.*

Whether]*štʿ*[in 1QH fr. 30 2 is a hithpael of *šāʿâ* is uncertain; *štʿ* is more likely.[10]

II. Literal Usage. Many of the contexts in which *šāʿâ* appears reflect the social structure of the ancient Near East: kings, princes, masters, and others in superior positions "oversee" their subjects, day laborers, slaves, and others of lower rank. The "seeing" in such typical situations is usually understood as an attentive watchfulness. If the relationship is more negative than positive, the "seeing" may manifest itself as inattention; alternatively, attention may intensify to the point where it becomes oppressive to those concerned. The reaction echoes the relationship between God and human beings, in which God stands on high, looked up to by mortals from below. In all such relationships, regardless of social status, those who suffer resent being exposed to the gaze of others. This situation brings us to the construction *šāʿâ min.*

In Ex. 5:6-9 Pharaoh orders the supervisors to double the quota demanded of the Hebrew slaves and to pay no attention to any complaints (v. 9). In Isa. 22:4 the prophet addresses the simple people who are inappropriately celebrating the withdrawal of an enemy from Jerusalem (Sennacherib's army, ca. 701 B.C.E.[11]): "Look away from me" *(šeʿû minnî),* so that he may weep bitter tears over the slain. In Isa. 32:3 the word *lōʾ* should be read as an asseverative particle (like Ugar. *l*): *welōʾ tiš'ênâ ʿênê rōʾîm weʾoznê šōmeʿîm tiqšaḇnâ,* "the eyes of those who see will behold indeed, the ears of those who hear will listen." This verse turns the irony of Isa. 6:9-10 and 29:9 on its head.

4. *HAL,* II, 1609.
5. *KTU* 1.4, VIII, 48; 1.6, VI, 56; 1.16, VI, 59.
6. *UT,* no. 2715; *ANET,* 135, 149.
7. Pp. 210-11.
8. Wehr, 412.
9. Contra *HAL,* II, 1610, 1671, which derives the forms from *štʿ*, "fear."
10. *HAL,* II, 1610.
11. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 139.

III. Theological Usage.

1. *Divine Attention.* Divine regard of the sort that brings joy to the individual finds expression in Gen. 4:4: "Yahweh looked (with favor) on Abel and his offering; but on Cain and his offering God did not look" (v. 5). Cain reacts with anger and "a fallen face," i.e., despair.[12]

The other passages where Yahweh is the subject of *šāʿâ* pray that Yahweh will look away from those who suffer. Job wishes that Yahweh would look away from him at least long enough for him to swallow his spittle: *kammâ lōʾ-tišʿeh mimmennî lōʾ-ṯarpēnî ʿaḏ-bilʿî ruqqî* (Job 7:19). Arabic uses the same expression: *ʾabliʿnī rīqī,* "let me swallow my spittle," which means "wait a minute, just a moment please."[13] Reflecting more generally on the human individual, whose life is so short and arduous, Job says to God: "Look away from him, that he may grow fat and enjoy his days like a day laborer" (14:6; *ḥdl* II, "be[come] fat," yields a better sense than *ḥdl* I, "desist"[14]). Here in the midst of his suffering Job refuses Yahweh's attention, because it is too persistent to bear. The afflicted psalmist in Ps. 39:14(13) expresses precisely this same feeling, thinking that a brief respite from Yahweh's punitive gaze would give him a moment of joy before death.

2. *Human Regard.* When *šāʿâ* refers to human regard of God or God's covenant, it conveys the notion of honor and respect. These reactions are considered positive, but they can have various results: Yahweh may accept them or reject them as unnecessary. Here the hithpael ("look apprehensively" or "be awe-struck") has the same meaning as *yrʾ,* "fear." Humans are expected to "fear" God (Gen. 22:12), even though Yahweh's first words in a theophany often are "Do not fear" (Gen. 15:1).

In a similar vein, the people are expected to pay attention or respect to Yahweh. For example, Isaiah attacks "those who go down to Egypt for help . . . , but do not look to the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. 31:1). After God's judgment, however, the people will once more regard their Maker and will have no regard for the altars that are the work of their own hands (Isa. 17:7-8). Ps. 119:17 prays for God's deliverance: "then I will have regard for your statutes continually." In 2 S. 22:42 the prayers of David's enemies are in vain: when they look for deliverance, Yahweh will not answer them. In Isa. 41:23 the prophet mocks the false gods, calling on them to do good or harm, that the people may be afraid of them (*šʿh* hithpael[15]). In fact, of course, they can do nothing. Yahweh, by contrast, comforts his people in a theophany: "Do not fear *(yrʾ),* for I am with you; do not be afraid *(šʿh),* for I am your God" (v. 10).

Lundbom

12. M. Gruber, *JQR* 69 (1978) 89-97.

13. G. B. Gray and S. R. Driver, *Job. ICC,* 2 vols. (1921), I, 74; M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* (³1973), 62.

14. → IV, 220.

15. *HAL,* II, 1671: *štʿ,* "fear."

שען *š'n*; מִשְׁעָן *miš'ān*; מִשְׁעֶנֶת *miš'enet̲*

I. Etymology. II. Distribution, Lexical Field, Constructions: 1. Verb; 2. Nouns. III. Usage: 1. Literal Meaning; 2. Figurative Meaning. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The etymology of the root *š'n* is unknown. In Northwest Semitic it appears in Middle Hebrew (*š'n;*[1] *miš'enet̲*[2]) as well as in Biblical Hebrew.[3] There must, however, have been a verbal root **s'n* in the Semitic of the 2d millennium B.C.E. that found its way not only into Hebrew but also into Arabic, as is clear from the Safaitic PNs *s'n* and *s'nt,*[4] as well as the PN *sa'na,* which appears four times in Classical Arabic genealogies, which are unlikely to derive etymologically from the Arabic lexicon, but more probably should be interpreted as "support," as in Hebrew.[5]

The interpretation of the verb as a (causative) shaphel of → ענה *'ānâ* II[6] was rightly rejected by Wächter, on the grounds that the reconstructed G stem would have to "have the basic meaning 'support,' and that is something quite different from the piel and hiphil of ענה with its basic meaning 'oppress, suppress.'"[7]

II. Distribution, Lexical Field, Constructions. The root *š'n* and its derivatives occur 40 times in the OT.

1. *Verb.* The verb, which means "support oneself, rely," occurs 22 times, always in the niphal (5 times each in DtrH, ChrH, and Isaiah; 2 in Job; once each in Genesis, Numbers, Ezekiel, Micah, and Proverbs). There are 5 additional occurrences in Sirach, including a hithpael in 44:8. The lexical field includes → סמך *sāmak̲* niphal (Jgs. 16:29 [cf. v. 26]; cf. 2 K. 18:21//Isa. 36:6 *smk* with Ezk. 29:7 *š'n*) and (particularly when *š'n* is used metaphorically) → בטח *bāṭaḥ* (2 K. 18:21; Isa. 31:1; 50:10; Prov. 3:5).

Except in Nu. 21:15, the verb always denotes a human activity. It is constructed 17 times with *'al* and once each with *bᵉ* (Isa. 50:10//*bṭḥ bᵉ*), *'el* (Prov. 3:5//*bṭḥ 'el*), and *lᵉ* (Nu. 21:15); twice it is used absolutely (Gen. 18:4; Job 24:3). The subject of *š'n* niphal may be an individual, such as Samson (Jgs. 16:26) or Saul (2 S. 1:6), or a group or col-

---

š'n. F. Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja. BZAW* 137 (1976), esp. 155-56; W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein. SANT* 24 (1970), esp. 123-24.

1. Jastrow, 1611.
2. Jastrow, 857; Dalman, *ANH*³, 258.
3. The Ugaritic occurrences in *KTU* 3.8 12, 14, erroneously listed under *š'n* by Whitaker, 604, actually belong under *ns'* (*UT,* no. 1663).
4. G. L. Harding, *Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabic Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 321.
5. Communication from E. A. Knauf.
6. Suggested by *KBL*², 1000; cf. *HAL,* II, 1612.
7. L. Wächter, *ZAW* 83 (1971) 386.

lective entity, such as the people or house of Israel (Isa. 30:12; 31:1; Ezk. 29:7), the members of the upper class (Mic. 3:11), or the people of Judah (2 Ch. 13:18). Objects include a companion's arm (*'al-yaḏ,* 2 K. 5:18; 7:2,17), a spear (*ḥanîṯ,* 2 S. 1:6), figuratively Yahweh (7 times),[8] other persons such as the king of Aram (2 Ch. 16:7) or the king of Egypt (Ezk. 29:7), and abstracts such as *'ōšeq* (Isa. 30:12) or one's own insight (Prov. 3:5).

2. *Nouns.* The noun *miš'eneṯ,* "support, staff," occurs 11 times (5 times in DtrH, once each in Exodus, Numbers, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Psalms). The noun *miš'ān,* "support," occurs 4 times (Isa. 3:1 [bis]; 2 S. 22:19//Ps. 18:19[Eng. 18]), with 3 additional occurrences in Sirach. Two forms of the noun *maš'ēn(â)* occur in Isa. 3:1.[9]

Equivalents include → מטה *maṭṭeh* (cf. esp. *maṭṭēh leḥem* in Lev. 26:26, etc., with *miš'an leḥem* in Isa. 3:1), → מקל *maqqēl,* and → שׁבט *šēḇeṭ* (Ps. 23:4). The noun *miš'eneṯ* appears 3 times as *nomen regens* in the construct phrase *miš'eneṯ (haq)qāneh* (2 K. 18:21; Isa. 36:6; Ezk. 29:6); it serves as the object of the vbs. *bāṭaḥ 'al,* "rely on"; *śîm,* "lay"; and *lāqaḥ,* "take."

Finally, the toponym *'eš'ān* appears in Josh. 15:52, referring to an unidentified town in Judah in the vicinity of Hebron.[10]

III. Usage.

1. *Literal Meaning.* The vb. *š'n* and the noun *miš'eneṯ* are used in their literal sense (*miš'ān* and *maš'ēn*[*â*] being used only figuratively) primarily in early historical and legal texts. "Supporting oneself" and using a staff may be signs of old age, sickness, or injury; but they may also be tokens of dignity or high rank. The staff also serves as a powerful symbol for the *śārîm* and *neḏîḇê hā'ām* (Nu. 21:18), the *mal'aḵ yhwh* (Jgs. 6:21), and a prophet (2 K. 4:29,31).

The earliest occurrence is undoubtedly Gen. 18:4: in the pre-J narrative (plural address[11]), Abraham invites the three men to rest under the tree (*taḥaṯ hā'ēṣ* as a circumstantial locative), probably next to its trunk, where they would find the most shade. Ex. 21:19a further qualifies the facts of the case stated in v. 18. An introductory temporal clause[12] defines the point in time when the culprit no longer has to fear blood vengeance (v. 12): when the injured party can appear again in public, albeit with the help of a staff (*'al-miš'antô).*

When the Philistine princes send for blind Samson to make fun of him, he asks the

---

8. See III.2 below.

9. On form and vocalization see *BLe,* §§211; 61rζ,sζ. On the use of masc. and fem. forms together to denote totality, see *GK,* §122v.

10. On its location see K. Elliger, *ZDPV* 57 (1934) 130-31; W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Leipzig, 1930), 69; a different location is proposed by *GTTOT,* §319.B.3; F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* II (Paris, 1967), 320.

11. F.-L. Hossfeld, in M. Bohnke and H. Heine, eds., *Im Gesprach mit dem dreiernen Gott. FS W. Breuning* (Düsseldorf, 1985), 64, with n. 24.

12. L. Schweinhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch. BZAW* 188 (1990), 53-54.

attendant guiding him to let him lean against the pillars of the house (*'eššā'ēn ʿalêhem*, Jgs. 16:26) instead of holding the attendant's hand. With his restored strength, he makes the pillars and the house collapse. In 2 S. 1:6 Saul has to lean on his staff during the battle at Gilboa, either because he suffered a fainting spell (v. 9) or because he was badly wounded (1 S. 31:3).

It must have been a sign of a king's high status to lean on the arm of an attendant. Naaman the Syrian appears to have played such a role for the king of Aram (2 K. 5:18); Joram of Israel also had an adjutant with this function (2 K. 7:2,17). Neither passage mentions any physical defect that would have required such support.

Zec. 8:4, a later text, also uses the literal meaning. Describing the age of salvation for Jerusalem, the prophet uses the image of an intact population and social structure, with an increased life expectancy (cf. the opposite in Jer. 9:20[21]; Lam. 2:11-12,21; 4:18): people will once more grow old in peace, resting on their staffs in the squares and streets of Jerusalem.

Nu. 21:15 represents a special case. Here the niphal of the verb is used (par. *nṭh*) in a geographical context to describe the border between the territory of the Amorites and Moab.

2. *Figurative Meaning*. In many passages where the niphal of *š'n* is used figuratively without reference to Yahweh, it conveys negative overtones of danger, futility, or deception, in explicit contrast to trust in Yahweh. Only Yahweh is the proper object of the reliance denoted by *š'n* niphal.

a. *Prophets*. Isaiah was the first to transfer the root *š'n*, familiar in secular usage, to the theological realm, especially to describe the relationship between the people and their God. This shift is clear in Isa. 3:1, where Jerusalem and Judah are denied all support and help on the part of God. A later redactor explained the double expression *maš'ēn wᵉmaš'ēnâ*[13] by introducing the more concrete image of a "bread staff" (*miš'an-leḥem;* cf. *maṭṭēh leḥem*[14]), referring to the provisions for the city, and its metaphorical parallel "water staff" *(miš'an-māyim),* which here probably denotes the city's drinking water. The latter expression came also to be used by the Mandeans.[15]

Isaiah himself repeatedly attacks the people of Judah and their leaders for their false reliance on the might of Egypt, with its multitude of horses and chariots, instead of trusting in Yahweh, the God of Israel. Without such trust, disaster will surely strike (Isa. 30:12; 31:1).

The salvation oracle in Isa. 10:20 (a late addition, specifically reversing 9:13[14]) speaks of the tiny remnant that will survive this disaster (identified more precisely as *pᵉlêṭaṯ bêṯ-yaʿaqōḇ* [*waw* explicative]). In time to come, they will "lean on Yahweh with faithful constancy" and no longer rely on political allies, who can provide only strife, not support. Yahweh will be the support they failed to find in their allies.[16] It is proba-

---

13. See II.2 above.

14. → VIII, 242-43; H. Schult, *ZDPV* 87 (1971) 206-8.

15. *MdD*, 352-53.

16. J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest. BWANT* 124 (1987), 149-50.

bly this remnant that Deutero-Isaiah calls upon in the darkness of exile, where "no light shines," to venture this trust once more (Isa. 50:10).

Isa. 36:6, which is dependent on 2 K. 18:21 (Dtr), shares with Ezk. 29:6-7 the image of a (hollow and therefore) fragile reed *(mišʿeneṯ [haq]qāneh hārāṣûṣ),* used to discredit Egypt as an unreliable ally (Ezk. 29:7, *šʿn ʿal*). The two passages date "from the very same year (588)"; in (the primary text) Ezk. 29:6-7, "the image is more self-contained; this is the image cited polemically by 2 K. 18."[17] The pro-Egyptian party in Jerusalem thus seeks to brand Ezekiel's oracle against Egypt as counterproductive enemy propaganda, already used by the Assyrians 120 years earlier, in the time of Hezekiah.[18]

Mic. 3:11 also dates from the late preexilic period, if not later, when people were attempting to assimilate the catastrophe of Jerusalem's fall. It attacks the venality of the leadership and above all their unshakable trust in Yahweh (*wᵉʿal-yhwh yiššāʿēnû* — Zion theology!).[19]

b. *ChrH.* The Chronicler adopts the figurative meaning of *šʿn* niphal in Isaiah for his own theological interpretation of Judahite politics in the time of kings Abijah and Asa. Turning Isa. 10:20 on its head, the seer Hanani accuses Asa of relying on *(šʿn ʿal)* the king of Aram in his war with the northern kingdom of Israel, even when reliance on *(šʿn ʿal)* Yahweh had already brought success against the even larger forces of the Libyans and Cushites.[20] If Judah's reliance on Yahweh brought success (2 Ch. 13:18), this success can even be appealed for in Asa's prayer to Yahweh (14:10[11]).

c. *Wisdom.* The metaphorical use of *šʿn* in large-scale political and social contexts becomes focused in wisdom literature on individuals and the world they live in. Trust in Yahweh is paired antithetically with a warning not to rely on one's own insight (Prov. 3:5). Those who, like the wicked, seek happiness apart from God and rely with a false sense of security on family and riches will not endure (Job 8:15). Job declares that the wicked in their self-confidence believe that they enjoy God's protection and support, since he watches over them benevolently, not punitively (Job 24:23). Of course one may detect an element of irony in the *wᵉyiqṭōl* verb form; and the use of *šʿn,* which conveys the negative side of reliance in the passages just cited, may suggest the hope that this reliance on the part of the wicked will ultimately prove false.

The psalmist, believing himself lost on account of the multitude and power of his enemies, found that Yahweh became his support (*lᵉmišʿān,* Ps. 18:19[18]). Ps. 23 is a psalm of trust, probably postexilic. The shepherd motif brings with it the terms "rod" (*šēḇeṭ* as a weapon of defense, v. 4) and "staff" (*mišʿeneṯ* as an instrument of guidance, v. 4), which provide comfort.[21] But whether the psalm is the prayer of an individual or

---

17. C. Hardmeier, *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas. BZAW* 187 (1990), 340.

18. Ibid., 344.

19. G. Münderlein, *Kriterion wahrer und falsche Prophetie. EH* XXIII/33 (1974), 26-27; J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique,* II. ÉtB (1978), 591-92; J. M. Vincent, *ZTK* 83 (1986) 169, with n. 14.

20. I. L. Seeligmann, *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977. SVT* 29 (1978), 277-78.

21. H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. FRLANT* 148 (1989), 270-71.

a description of Israel on the way, it is certainly legitimate to see in *miš'enet* a metaphor representing the *tôrâ* and its guidance, as we also find in the Midrash.[22]

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX uses a whole series of verbs to translate *š'n* niphal; the specific choice depends on the actual context. The commonest are *peíthein* (used 8 times), *epanapaúsein* (4), and *epistērízein* (twice plus Ezk. 29:7 Symm.). For the nouns, we find *rhábdos* (used 6 times), *baktēría* (4), and *ischýs* plus the vb. *ischýein* (both used twice in Isa. 3:1).

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The verb occurs 14 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, *mš'nt* 4 times, and *mš'n* twice. Apart from 4QpHos[b] 2:13, which refers to political reliance on nations that cannot provide help, the occurrences all reflect the figurative meaning and use of the word, especially as found in OT wisdom literature; they elevate it to a position of existential importance for the individual. This is clear already in 1QS 5:18, a programmatic requirement for admission to the community: "No man of holiness may support himself on any deed of futility"; almost all contact with outsiders, who "do not know his covenant" (l. 19), is forbidden.[23] He knows that his "support is a refuge on high" (1QH 10:32). God's eternal being *(hww' 'wlm)* and might *(gbwrh)* are "the support of his right hand" (1QS 11:4-5; cf. the banner named "God's support" in 1QM 4:13). The outstanding mark of the enemy is that their support is the void (*mš'ntm klw' hyth,* 1QM 17:4). The community member does not "place his support" on profit or possessions (1QH 10:23) but on God's grace (*ḥsd,* 1QS 4:4; 10:16; 1QH 4:36-37; cf. 1QH fr. 4 13 [*ṭwb*]), mercy (*rḥmym,* 1QH 7:18; 11:32), and truth (*'mt,* 1QH 6:25; 10:17). He relies confidently on Yahweh's name (*šm,* 11QApPs[a] 1:8).[24]

Dahmen

22. A. Wünsche, *Midrasch Tehillim,* I (1892, repr. Hildesheim, 1967), 214.

23. Paschen, 123-24.

24. On the reconstruction of the text and the general context, see É. Puech, *RevQ* 14 (1989/90) 386-89, 392.

שָׁעַע šā'a'; שִׁעֲשַׁע ši'ªša'; שַׁעֲשֻׁעִים ša'ªšû'îm

I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Etymology. II. Usage: 1. š'' I; 2. š'' II. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. LXX.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* In both the OT and the Dead Sea Scrolls, š'' has two very different uses. The first root, š'' I, has the meaning "paste together," usually in contexts associated with God's judgment. There are three clear occurrences of this verb in Isaiah: a hiphil in 6:10 and a qal and hithpalpel in 29:9, where Hesse appears to be correct in his assertion that there is no discernible difference in meaning between the two conjugations.[1] Two other occurrences are questionable: Isa. 32:3 and Ps. 39:14(Eng. 13).

The second root, š'' II, means "delight"; it appears primarily in prayers. Ps. 119 uses it as a verb 3 times: a pilpel in v. 70, a pilpel passive in vv. 16 and 47. The same psalm uses the root as a noun in vv. 24,77,92,143,174. A pilpel also appears in 94:19. There are 2 occurrences in the book of Isaiah: a pilpel in 11:8 and a pilpel passive in 66:12. Sir. 13:6 uses the verb in the hiphil; there is also an uncertain occurrence in 41:21. Nouns derived from the root are found in Isa. 5:7; Jer. 31:20; Prov. 8:30-31. There are numerous occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[2]

2. *Etymology.* Outside Hebrew, the root š'' appears in Syriac as *ša'* and in Mandaic as *ŠAA* II and *ŠUA*, both of which mean "be smooth, make smooth."[3] Copt. *sôi* is similar. Parallel to š'' II, Syriac has a noun *še'yā;* Mandaic has a noun *šaiata* derived from *ŠAA* I. It is clear from the evidence of these parallels that both derivatives of š'' go back to an analogous notion of "making smooth." The use of the root š'' in the sense of "smooth" is also illustrated by the translation of Gen. 27:11,16 in Tg. Neofiti.[4] It is possible that š'' I suggests the "smoothness" of eyes when they are shut, whereas š'' II may suggest a "smoothing" of emotions. Tigr. *sæ'æ'e,* "dance," is rather different.[5]

II. Usage.

1. *š'' I.* In Isa. 29:9 we find the imperatives "be pasted together and blinded." The continuation in v. 10 shows that both the qal and the hithpalpel of š'' in v. 9 should be understood in the sense of shutting one's eyes.[6] The people to whom the imperatives are addressed are not specified. The context might suggest the inhabitants of Jerusalem;[7] the

---

šā'a'. F. Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im AT. BZAW* 74 (1955), esp. 14-15.

1. P. 15.
2. See III below.
3. *MdD,* 438.
4. See also *HAL,* II, 1613.
5. For a general treatment see ibid.
6. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 267 n. b.
7. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 82.

nations mentioned in vv. 7-8 are another possibility.[8] By no means is the notion of blinding limited to a physical action; it stands metaphorically for shutting one's eyes to the will of God.

Isa. 6:10 uses the hiphil imperative of *š''* similarly, with eyes as its object. The parallel command to make the ears of the people deaf shows clearly that *š''* is a command to make their eyes blind. The LXX says instead that the people have closed their own eyes.

If we follow Wildberger in deriving *tš'ynh* in Isa. 32:3 from *š''* rather than *š'h,* we have an additional occurrence of *š''* I.[9] Here, however, blind eyes do not appear in the context of a judgment oracle; on the contrary, the text speaks of a coming time when eyes will no longer be blind. Ps. 39:14(13) should not be included in the list of occurrences of *š''* I; it is better to accept the proposed emendation of *hāša'* to *še'ēh.*

2. *š'' II.* Isa. 11 describes the cosmic peace brought by the messiah; in v. 8 *š'š'* describes a nursing child playing over the hole of the asp. The verb thus appears in the context of eschatological expectation. Isa. 5:7, where *ša'ašû'îm* is a positive qualifier of Yahweh's vineyard, is closely related.[10] In both texts *š'š'* describes joyful behavior or a piece of property that brings joy. The perspective of Isa. 66:12 is also eschatological: it promises that Yahweh will extend prosperity to Jerusalem, so that small children may be cuddled.

Texts in the Psalms use the root *š''* in the context of the benefits received from Yahweh. In Ps. 94:19 Yahweh's consolations cheer the psalmist, who knows that God intervenes on his behalf against the wicked. Ps. 119:16 contrasts the upright psalmist, who delights in Yahweh's statutes and does not forget Yahweh's word, to those who do not observe the law. V. 47 also stresses the psalmist's joy and delight in Yahweh's commandments, which he loves. In v. 70, similarly, the psalmist expresses his delight in Yahweh's law, in contrast to the insolent (there is no need to emend *twrtk* to *'dwtk*[11]). The nominal use of *š''* in Ps. 119 is analogous. Vv. 24,77,92,143, and 174 speak of the psalmist's delight in Yahweh's law, a delight that sustains him even in affliction.

The notion of joy is also conveyed by the use of the root *š''* when persons are the source of delight. In Jer. 31:20, in parallel with *bēn yāqîr,* Ephraim is the *yeleḏ ša'ašû'îm,* "son, in whom the father delights."[12] The root is also associated with a personified entity in Prov. 8:30, where wisdom was Yahweh's daily delight; according to v. 31, wisdom in turn delighted in the human race.

By contrast, Sir. 13:6 cautions that a rich man will bring joy to a poor man only when he needs him.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. The root *š''* is quite common in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially in 1QH, where it occurs 7 times in the extended sense of "gladden." In 1QH 7:21 the experience of the "sons of favor/men of portent" is like that of a suckling child at

8. B. Duhm, *Jesaia. HKAT* III/1 (1892), 209.
9. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 231.
10. O. Procksch, *Jesaia I. KAT* IX (1930), 155.
11. As proposed by F. Baethgen, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (^{3}1904), 364.
12. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 185.

the breast of its wet nurse (pilpel). Having experienced God's wonders and favor, the hymnist delights in the abundance of God's mercy (9:8). L. 13 speaks of delight in forgiveness, and in l. 32 the hymnist declares that God delights him through the holy spirit. In parallel with *śāś*, 10:31 says that the hymnist delights in God's covenant and truth. According to 11:(6),7, the abundance of God's goodness delights the hymnist. In 1QSb 2:23 the speaker (?) prays that God will delight him and be gracious to him.

But *š*'' I also appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Like Isa. 6:10, the fragmentary text 4Q504 18 4 uses *š*'' for Yahweh's shutting of eyes and ears; 4Q509 157 2, which mentions only eyes, is similar. In 1QH 7:2-3 the hymnist's eyes and ears are shut from seeing and hearing so much evil.

V. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translations for *š*''. In Isa. 6:10 it uses *kammýein* for *š*'' I; no equivalent is provided in 29:9. For *š*'' as a noun in Ps. 119, we find *melétē*. The verb is represented by *agapán, euphraínein, eneuphraínesthai, meletán, parakaleín, entryphán,* and *proschaírein.*

Hausmann

שַׁעַר *ša'ar*

I. Etymology. II. Semantics: 1. Akkadian; 2. The Lexeme; 3. Deuteronomy. III. Iron Age Gates. IV. Pre-Hellenistic Jerusalem. V. Functions: 1. Defense; 2. Civil Functions. VI. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

ša'ar. P. Albenda, "The Gateway and Portal Stone Reliefs from Arslan Tash," *BASOR* 271 (1988) 5-30; M. M. Aranov, "The Biblical Threshing-Floor in the Light of the Ancient Near Eastern Evidence" (diss., New York University, 1977); A. Badawy, *Le dessin architectural chez les anciens égyptiens* (Cairo, 1948); W. Beyerlin, *Weisheitlich-kultische Heilsordnung. BThS* 9 (1985), esp. 94-97; H.-J. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the OT and Ancient Near East* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1980), esp. 30-33, 64-65; G. P. F. van den Boorn, "*Wḏ'-ryt* and Justice at the Gate," *JNES* 44 (1985) 1-25; G. Brands, *Republikanische Stadttore in Italien* (Oxford, 1988); H. Brunner, "Die Rolle von Tür und Tor im Alten Ägypten," *Symbolon* 6 (1982) 37-52; idem, "Tür und Tor," *LexÄg,* VI, 778-87; J. Buchholz, *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium. GTA* 36 (1988), esp. 60-75, 83-105; E. D. van Buren, "The Guardians of the Gate in the Akkadian Period," *Or* 16 (1947) 312-32; T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem,* I-II (Leiden, 1970-80); F. Crüsemann, "Das Gericht im Tor," in J. Hausmann and H.-J. Zobel, eds., *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und biblische Theologie. FS H. D. Preuss* (Stuttgart, 1992), 69-79; M. S. Damerji, "Die Entwicklung der Tür- and Torarchitektur in Mesopotamien" (diss., Munich, 1973); L. Delekat, "Tor, Tür," *BHHW,* III, 2009-10; G. Evans, "'Coming' and 'Going' at the City Gate," *BASOR* 150 (1958) 28-33; idem, "'Gates' and 'Streets,'" *Journal of Religious History* 2 (1962) 1-12; J. M. Fossey, ed., *Fortificationes antiquae* (Amsterdam, 1992); H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (London, [4]1970); F. S. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel. SBLDS* 36 (1977); V. Fritz, "Paläste während der Bronze- und Eisenzeit in Palästina,"

ZDPV 99 (1983) 1-42; idem, *Die Stadt im Alten Israel* (Munich, 1990); idem, *Tempel und Zelt. WMANT* 47 (1977); K. Galling, "Der Bautypus des Palasttores im AT und das Palasttor von Sichem," in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas. FS E. Sellin* (Leipzig, 1927), 49-53; idem, "Der Beichtspiegel," *ZAW* 47 (1929) 125-30; idem, "Die Halle des Schreibers," *PJ* 27 (1931) 51-57; idem, "Tor," *BRL*[1], 511-25; idem, "Tür," *BRL*[1], 525-26; idem and H. Rösel, "Tür," *BRL*[2], 348-49; G. Garbini, "The Stepped Pinnacle in the Ancient Near East," *East and West* 9 (1958) 85-90; O. García de la Fuente, "Liturgias de entrada, normas de asilo o exhortaciones proféticas?" *Aug* 9 (1969) 166-98; J. C. Gertz, "Die Gerichtsorganisation Israels im deuteronomischen Gesetz" (diss., Göttingen, 1993); C. H. J. de Geus, *De israëlitische Stad. Palaestina antiqua* 3 (1984); H. Goedicke, "Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Rechtsprechung," *MIO* 8 (1963) 333-67; J. Gray, "The *Goren* at the City Gate," *PEQ* 85 (1953) 118-23; R. Grieshammer, "Zum 'Sitz im Leben' des negativen Sündenbekenntnisses," *ZDMG Sup* 2 (1974), 19-25; H. Haag, "Jerusalemer Profanbauten in den Psalmen," *ZDPV* 93 (1977), 87-96, esp. 95-96; G. Haeny, "Scheintür," *LexÄg*, V, 563-74; A. I. Harari, *Contribution à l'étude de la procedure judiciaire dans l'ancien empire égyptien* (Cairo, 1950); E. Heinrich, *Die Paläste im alten Mesopotamien* (Berlin, 1984); idem, *Die Tempel und Heiligtümer im alten Mesopotamien* (Berlin, 1982); Z. Herzog, *Das Stadttor in Israel und in den Nachbarländern* (Mainz/Rhein, 1986); idem and J. E. Stambaugh, "Cities in the Levant," *ABD*, I, 1031-48; E. Hornung, *Ägyptische Unterweltsbücher* (Zurich, 1984); F.-L. Hossfeld, "Nachlese zu neueren Studien der Einzugsliturgie von Ps 15," in J. Zmijewski, ed., *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung. FS H. Reinelt* (Stuttgart, 1990), 135-56; J. Jeremias, "θύρα," *TDNT*, III, 173-80; idem, "πύλη," *TDNT*, VI, 921-28; A. S. Kapelrud, "The Gates of Hell and the Guardian Angels of Paradise," *JAOS* 70 (1950) 151-56; O. Keel, "Zeichen der Verbundenheit," in P. Casetti et al., eds., *FS D. Barthélemy. OBO* 38 (1981), 159-240, esp. 183-92, 230-34; K. Koch, "Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge," in R. Rendtorff and K. Koch, eds., *Studien zur Theologie des alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1961), 45-60 = *Spuren des hebräischen Denkens* (1991), 169-83; L. Köhler, "Justice in the Gate," appendix to *Hebrew Man* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1956), 127-50; O. Königsberger, *Die Konstruktion der ägyptischen Tür. Ägyptologische Forschungen* 2 (1936); H.-J. Kraus, "Archäologische und topographische Probleme Jerusalems im Lichte der Psalmenexegese," *ZDPV* 75 (1959) 125-40; H. Lauter, *Die Architektur des Hellenismus* (Darmstadt, 1986); A. W. Lawrence, *Greek Aims in Fortifications* (Oxford, 1979); H. Lesêtre, "Porte," *DB*, V, 548-55; B. M. Levinson, "The Hermeneutics of Innovation" (diss., Brandeis, 1991); C. Locher, *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel. OBO* 70 (1986), esp. 373-80; O. Loretz, "*šʿr hmlk* — 'Das Tor des Königs' (Est 2,19)," *WO* 4 (1967/68) 104-8; B. Z. Luria, "Joshua, Officer of the City, and the High Places of the Gate (2 Kgs 23,8)," *BethM* 23 (1978) 136-38 (Heb.); M. Lurker, "Tür/Tor," *Wörterbuch biblischer Bilder und Symbole* (Munich, [2]1978), 326-29; R. Martin, *Recherches sur l'agora grecque* (Paris, 1951); V. H. Matthews, "Entrance Ways and Threshing Floors," *Fides et Historia* 19 (1987) 25-40; J. W. McKay, "Exodus XXIII 1-3, 6-8," *VT* 21 (1971) 311-25; D. A. McKenzie, "Judicial Procedure at the Town Gate," *VT* 14 (1964) 100-104; P. A. Miglus, "Die Stadttore in Assur," *ZA* 72 (1982) 266-79; A. R. Millard, "The Celestial Ladder and the Gate of Heaven (Genesis XXVIII.12,17)," *ExpT* 78 (1966/67) 86-87; D. Milson, "The Design of the Royal Gates at Megiddo, Hazor, and Gezer," *ZDPV* 102 (1986) 87-92; J. Morgenstern, "The Gates of Righteousness," *HUCA* 6 (1929) 1-37; R. Motte, "Porte," *DBS*, VIII, 126-36; S. Mowinckel, "I porten," *FS F. Buhl* (1925), 167-80; U. Müller, "Tor," *BRL*[2], 346-48; R. Naumann, *Architektur Kleinasiens von ihren Anfängen bis zum Ende der hethitischen Zeit* (Tübingen, [2]1971); H. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung in Israel. SBS* 130 (1987); R. Opificius, "Befestigungen des Zweistromlandes im Beginn des Zweiten Jahrtausends," *FS E. Heinrich. BaghM* 3 (1964), 78-90; E. Otto, "Kultus und Ethos in Jerusalemer Theologie," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 161-79; L. B. Paton, "The Meaning of the Expression 'Between the Two Walls,'" *JBL* 25 (1906) 1-13; E. Porada, "Battlements in the Military Architecture and the Symbolism of the Ancient Near East," *FS R. Wittkower*, I (London, 1967), 1-12;

R. Reich, "Palaces and Residencies in the Iron Age," in A. Kempinski and R. Reich, eds., *The Architecture of Ancient Israel from the Prehistoric to the Persian Period* (Jerusalem, 1992), 202-22; E. Reuter, *Kultzentralisation. BBB* 87 (1993); A. Salonen, *Die Türen des alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 124 (1961); S. Sauneron, "La justice à la Porte des Temples," *BIFAO* 54 (1954) 117-27; J. Schmidt, "Strassen in altorientalischen Wohngebieten," *FS E. Heinrich. BaghM* 3 (1964), 125-47; Y. Shiloh, "The Casemate Wall, the Four Room House, and Early Planning in the Israelite City," *BASOR* 268 (1987) 3-15; idem, "Elements in the Development of Town Planning in the Israelite City," *IEJ* 28 (1978) 36-51; S. Smith, "On the Meaning of *Goren*," *PEQ* 85 (1953) 42-45; idem, "The Threshing Floor at the City Gate," *PEQ* 78 (1946) 5-14; E. A. Speiser, "'Coming' and 'Going' in the 'City' Gate," *BASOR* 144 (1956) 20-23; P. Spencer, *The Egyptian Temple* (London, 1984); W. Spiegelberg, *Studien und Materialien zum Rechtswesen des Pharaonenreiches der Dynastie XVIII-XXI* (Hannover, 1892); S. Ö. Steingrimsson, *Tor der Gerechtigkeit. ATS* 22 (1984); B. H. Stricker, "De praehellense ascese," *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijkmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden* 57 (1976) 129-97, 299-333; A. Walther, *Das altbabylonische Gerichtswesen. Leipziger semitische Studien* VI/4-6 (1917), esp. 64-67; H. Wehr, "Das 'Tor des Königs' im Buche Esther und verwandte Ausdrücke," *Der Islam* 39 (1964) 247-60; M. Weinfeld, "Instructions for Temple Visitors in the Bible and in Ancient Egypt," in S. Israel-Groll, ed., *Egyptological Studies. ScrHier* 28 (1982) 224-50; W. Wiebach, *Die ägyptische Scheintür* (Hamburg, 1981); G. R. H. Wright, "Temple and Gate in Palestine," in S. Shaath, ed., *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Palestine,* II (Aleppo, 1987), 173-77; J. W. Wright, "Guarding the Gates," *JSOT* 48 (1990) 69-81; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery,* 2 vols. (Eng. tr. New York, 1963); W. Zimmerli, "Ezechieltempel und Salomostadt," *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie. ThB* 51 (1974), 148-64 (repr. from *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 [1967], 398-414); W. Zwickel, "סף II und מפתן," *BN* 70 (1993) 25-27.

III: Y. Aharoni, "The Building Activities of David and Solomon," *IEJ* 24 (1974) 13-16; idem, "The Date of the Casemate Walls in Judah and Israel and Their Purpose," *BASOR* 154 (1959) 35-39; W. F. Albright, *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim, III: The Iron Age. AASOR* 21-22 (1943); idem, "Was the Age of Solomon Without Monumental Art?" *ErIsr* 5 (1958) 1-9; W. Andrae, *Die Festungswerke von Assur. WVDOG* 23 (1913); J. Beit-Arieh, "Tel 'Ira — 1980," *Hadashot Arkheologiot* 74/75 (1981) 31-33 (Heb.); R. Besenval, *Technologie de la voûte dans l'Orient Ancien,* I-II (Paris, 1984); A. Biran, "The Discovery of the Middle Bronze Age Gate at Dan," *BA* 44 (1981) 139-44; idem, "The Gate of Laish at Dan," *Qad* 15 (1982) 107-17 (Heb.); idem, *Tel Dan* (Tel Aviv, 1992) (Heb.); idem, "Tell Dan," *IEJ* 22 (1972) 164-66; idem, "Tell Dan, Five Years Later," *BA* 43 (1980) 168-82; idem, "The Triple-Arched Gate of Laish at Tel Dan," *IEJ* 34 (1984) 1-19; A. Chambon, *Tell el-Far'ah. I. L'Age du fer* (Paris, 1984); J. D. Currid, "The Re-Stratification of Megiddo During the United Monarchy," *ZDPV* 107 (1991) 28-38; W. G. Dever, "Further Evidence on the Date of the Outer Wall at Gezer," *BASOR* 289 (1993) 33-54; idem, "Gezer," *ABD,* II, 998-1003; idem, "The Gezer Fortifications and the 'High Place,'" *PEQ* 105 (1973) 61-70; idem, "Gezer Revisited," *BA* 47 (1984) 206-18; idem, "Late Bronze Age and Solomonic Defenses at Gezer," *BASOR* 262 (1986) 9-34; idem, "The Late Bronze, Iron Age, and Hellenistic Defenses of Gezer," *JJS* 33 (1982) 19-34; idem, "The MB IIC Stratification in the Northwest Gate Area at Shechem," *BASOR* 216 (1974) 31-52; idem, "Monumental Architecture in Ancient Israel in the Period of the United Monarchy," in T. Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Winona Lake, 1982), 269-306; idem, "Of Myths and Methods," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990) 121-30; idem et al., "Further Excavations at Gezer, 1967-1971," *BA* 39 (1971) 94-132; idem et al., *Gezer I* (Jerusalem, 1970); idem et al., *Gezer II* (Jerusalem, 1974); idem and R. W. Younker, "Tel Gezer, 1990," *IEJ* 41 (1991) 282-96; M. Dothan and D. Conrad, "Akko, 1983," *IEJ* 34 (1984) 189-90; M. Dothan and A. Raban, "The Sea Gate of Ancient Akko," *BA* 43 (1980) 35-39; V. F. Fargo, "Is the Solomonic City Gate of Megiddo

Really Solomonic?" *BAR* 9/5 (1983) 8-13; I. Finkelstein, "The Date of Gezer's Outer Wall," *TAJ* 8 (1981) 136-45; idem, "On Archaeological Methods and Historical Considerations," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990) 109-19; V. Fritz, *Kinnereth. ADPV* 15 (1990); Z. Gal, "Cabul, Jiphthah-El and the Boundary Between Asher and Zebulon in the Light of Archaeological Evidence," *ZDPV* 101 (1985) 114-37; S. Gitin, "Tel Miqne-Ekron," in Gitin and W. Dever, eds., *Recent Excavations in Israel. AASOR* 49 (1989) 23-58; B. Gregori, "'Three Entrance' City Gates of the Middle Bronze Age in Syria and Palestine," *Levant* 18 (1986) 83-102; A. Harif, "Common Architectural Features at Alalakh, Megiddo and Shechem," *Levant* 11 (1979) 162-67; Z. Herzog, *Beer-sheba II* (Tel Aviv, 1984); idem, "Enclosed Settlements in the Negeb and the Wilderness of Beer-sheba," *BASOR* 250 (1983) 41-49; idem, "Fortifications (Levant)," *ABD*, II, 844-52; idem, "Settlement and Fortification Planning in the Iron Age," in Kempinski and Reich, 231-74; idem et al., "The Israelite Fortress at Arad," *BASOR* 254 (1984) 1-34; J. S. Holladay Jr., "Red Slip, Burnish, and the Solomonic Gateway at Gezer," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990) 23-70; B. Hrouda, *Vorderasien* I (Munich, 1971); M. Ibrahim and S. Mittmann, "Zeiraqun (Kirbet el)," *Archaeological Journal* 2/2 (1989) 641-46; F. W. James, *The Iron Age at Beth-Shan* (Philadelphia, 1966); S. Johnson, *Late Roman Fortifications* (London, 1983); J. Kaplan, *Biṣurei tekufat ha-bronza ha-tikhona be Eretz Israel. Publications of the Museum Tel Aviv-Jaffa* 4 (1972); G. L. Kelm, "Tel Batash (Timnah) 1987-1988," *IEJ* 39 (1989) 108-10; idem and A. Mazar, "Three Seasons of Excavations at Tel Batash — Biblical Timnah," *BASOR* 248 (1982) 1-36; A. Kempinski, "Fortifications, Public Buildings, and Town Planning in the Early Bronze Age," in idem and Reich, 68-80; idem, *Megiddo* (Munich, 1989); idem, "Middle and Late Bronze Fortifications," ibid., 127-42; idem, review of Dever et al., *Gezer I, IEJ* 22 (1972) 183-86; K. M. Kenyon, review of Dever et al., *Gezer II, PEQ* 109 (1977) 55-58; idem, *Royal Cities of the OT* (London, 1971); R. S. Lamon and G. M. Shipton, *Megiddo I. OIP* 42 (1939); J. C. H. Laughlin, "The Remarkable Discoveries at Tel Dan," *BAR* 7/5 (1981) 20-37; G. Leick, *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Architecture* (London, 1988); G. Loud, *Megiddo II. OIP* 62 (1948); R. A. S. Macalister, *Excavations of Gezer I-III* (London, 1912); J.-C. Margueron, review of Herzog, *Das Stadttor in Israel und in den Nachbarländern, WO* 18 (1987) 195-97; P. Matthiae, *Ebla* (Eng. tr. Garden City, 1981); A. Mazar, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible* (New York, 1990); C. C. McCown, *Tell en-Naṣbeh I* (Berkeley, 1947); D. Milson, "The Design of the Royal Gates at Megiddo, Hazor, and Gezer," *ZDPV* 102 (1986) 87-92; idem, "The Design of the Temples and Gates at Shechem," *PEQ* 119 (1987) 97-105; idem, "On the Design of the City Gates at Lachish and Ashdod," *Jahrbuch des deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des heiligen Landes* 2 (1990) 15-21; A. Moortgat, "Das antike Torgebäude in seiner baugeschichtlichen Entwicklung" (diss., Berlin, 1923); idem, *Die Kunst des Alten Mesopotamien, II: Babylonien und Assyrien* (Cologne, [2]1984); E. Otto, *Jakob in Sichem. BWANT* 110 (1979); P. J. Parr, "The Origin of the Rampart Fortifications of Middle Bronze Age Palestine and Syria," *ZDPV* 84 (1968) 18-45; G. D. Pratico, "Nelson Glueck's 1938-1940 Excavations at Tell el-Kheleifeh," *BASOR* 259 (1985) 1-32; R. Reich and B. Brandl, "Gezer under Assyrian Rule," *PEQ* 117 (1985) 41-54; A. Rowe, *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan* (1940); J. D. Seger, "The MB II Fortifications at Shechem and Gezer," *FS N. Glueck. ErIsr* 12 (1975) 34*-45*; idem, "The Middle Bronze II C Date of the East Gate at Shechem," *Levant* 6 (1974) 117-30; E. Sellin, "Die Ausgrabung von Sichem," *ZDPV* 49 (1926) 304-20; Y. Shiloh, "Solomon's Gate at Megiddo as Recorded by Its Excavator, R. Lamon, Chicago," *Levant* 12 (1980) 69-76; E. Stern, "The Fortified City Gate and the Struggle for It Under the Monarchy," in J. Lever, ed., *The Ancient Fortifications in the Land of Israel in Biblical Times* (Jerusalem, 1964), 400-409 (Heb.); idem, "Hazor, Dor and Megiddo in the Time of Ahab and Under Assyrian Rule," *IEJ* 40 (1990) 12-30; idem, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538-332* B.C. (Warminster, 1982); idem and I. Sharon, "Tel Dor, 1986," *IEJ* 37 (1987) 201-11; E. Stern, I. Sharon, and J. Berg, "Tel Dor, 1988-1989," *IEJ* 41 (1991), 46-61; E. Stern, I. Sharon, and A. Gilboa, "Tel Dor, 1991," *IEJ* 42 (1992) 34-46; J.-M. de Tarragon, review of Herzog, *Das Stadttor in Israel und in den Nach-*

barländern, RB 94 (1987) 630-31; O. Tufnell, *Lachish III* (London, 1953); D. Ussishkin, "Excavations at Tel Lachish 1978-1983," *TAJ* 10 (1983) 97-175; idem, "Megiddo," *ABD*, IV, 666-79; idem, "Notes on Megiddo, Gezer, Ashdod, and Tel Batash in the Tenth and Ninth Centuries B.C.," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990) 71-91; idem, "Notes on the Fortifications of the Middle Bronze II Period at Jericho and Shechem," *BASOR* 276 (1989), 29-53; idem, "Restoring the Great Gate at Lachish," *BAR* 14/2 (1988) 42-47; idem, "Was the 'Solomonic' City Gate at Megiddo Built by King Solomon?" *BASOR* 239 (1980) 1-18; H. Weippert, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit. Handbuch der Archäologie* II/1 (Munich, 1988); R. Wenning, review of Herzog, *Das Stadttor in Israel und in den Nachbarländern, TRev* 86 (1990) 106-10; G. J. Wightman, "Megiddo VI A-III. Associated Structures and Chronology," *Levant* 17 (1985) 117-29; idem, "The Myth of Solomon," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990) 5-22; I. Winter, *Greek Fortifications* (London, 1971); L. Woolley, *Carchemish II: The Town Defences* (London, 1921); G. E. Wright, *Shechem* (New York, 1965); G. R. H. Wright, "The City Gates at Shechem," *ZDPV* 101 (1985) 1-8; idem, "Co-ordinating the Survey of Shechem over Sixty Years 1913-1973," *ZDPV* 89 (1973) 188-96; idem, "Gates," *Ancient Building in South Syrian and Palestine I. HO* VII 1,2 B/3 (1985), 191-206, ills. 94-111; idem, "The Monumental City Gate in Palestine and Its Foundations," *ZA* 74 (1984) 267-89; Y. Yadin, *Hazor* (1972); idem, "Hyksos Fortifications and the Battering-Ram," *BASOR* 137 (1955) 23-32; idem, "Megiddo of the Kings of Israel," *BA* 33 (1970) 66-96; idem, "New Light on Solomon's Megiddo," *BA* 23 (1960) 62-68; idem, "A Rejoinder," *BASOR* 239 (1980) 19-23; idem, "Solomon's City Wall and Gate at Gezer," *IEJ* 8 (1958) 80-86; idem et al., *Hazor III-IV* (Jerusalem, 1961); E. and S. Yeivin, "The Ancient Fortifications in the Land of Israel," in J. Liver, ed., *The Military History of Israel in Biblical Times* (Jerusalem, 1964), 362-99 (Heb.); A. Zertal, "The Gates of Gezer," *FS Y. Aharoni. ErIsr* 15 (1981) 222-28 (Heb.).

IV: A. Alt, "Das Taltor von Jerusalem," *PJ* 24 (1928) 74-98 = *KlSchr*, III (1959), 326-47; N. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville, 1983); M. Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemiah," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 239-48; K. Bieberstein and H. Bloedhorn, *Jerusalem*, I-III. *Tübinger Atlas zum Vorderen Orient Beihefte* B 100/1-3 (1994); W. F. Birch, "Nehemiah's Wall," *PEFQS* 1889, 206-9; 1890, 126-30; idem, "The Valley Gate," *PEFQS* 1898, 168-69; F. J. Bliss and E. C. Dickie, *Excavations at Jerusalem 1894-1897* (London, 1898); M. Burrows, "Nehemiah 3:1-32 as a Source for the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem," *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, I. *AASOR* 14 (1934), 115-40; idem, "Nehemiah's Tour of Inspection," *BASOR* 64 (1936) 11-21; M. Cimosa, "Gerusalemme, le mura e le sue porte," *Parole di Vita* 26 (1981) 67-70; B. Cohen, *Portes de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1985); E. W. Cohn, "The History of Jerusalem's Benjamin Gate," *PEQ* 118 (1986) 138-43; C. Conder, "The South Wall of Jerusalem," *PEFQS* 1889, 145-46; J. W. Crowfoot and G. M. Fitzgerald, *Excavations in the Tyropoeon Valley, Jerusalem 1927. Annual of the Palestine Exploration Fund* 5 (1929); G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände* (Hildesheim, [2]1972), with sups. by P. Freimark; A. De Groot and D. T. Ariel, *Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985, II. Qedem* 33 (1992); J. Fischer, "Die Mauern und Tore des biblischen Jerusalem," *TQ* 113 (1932) 221-88; 114 (1933) 73-85; H. J. Franken, "The Excavations of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem on the South-East Hill in the Light of Subsequent Research," *Levant* 19 (1987) 129-35; K. Fullerton, "The Procession of Nehemiah, Neh. 12:31-39," *JBL* 38 (1919) 171-79; P. Haupt, "The Tophet Gate," *JBL* 37 (1981) 232-33; K. M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem* (New York, 1974); P. J. King, "Jerusalem," *ABD*, III, 747-66; E.-M. Laperrousaz, "A propos du 'premier mur' et du 'deuxième mur' de Jérusalem, ainsi que du rempart de Jérusalem à l'époque de Néhémie," *REJ* 138 (1979) 1-16; idem, "Le problème du 'premier mur' et du 'deuxième mur' de Jérusalem après la réfutation décisive du la 'minimalist view,'" *FS G. Vajda* (Louvain, 1980), 13-35; idem, "Quelques remarques sur le rempart de Jérusalem à l'époque du Néhémie," *FS A. Klawek. FO* 21 (1980) 179-85; D. C. Liid, "Corner Gate," *ABD*, I, 1156; idem, "Dung Gate," *ABD*, II, 240; idem, "Ephraim Gate," *ABD*, II, 556; idem, "Fish Gate," *ABD*, II, 797-98; idem, "Foundation Gate," *ABD*, II, 853; idem, "Fountain Gate," *ABD*, II, 853-54; idem, "Gate Between the Two Walls," *ABD*, II, 907-8; idem, "Gate of the Guard," *ABD*, II, 908; idem,

I. Etymology. Heb. *šaʿar* (I), "gate," is a nondeverbal primary noun[1] vocalized as a segholate; the plural is *šᵉʿārîm*. It belongs to the West Semitic branch of the Semitic language group. Ugar. *ṯġr,* "gate" > "gatekeeper"[2] has preserved the original form of the noun.[3] In one of the Amarna letters[4] from Megiddo, Akk. *abullu,* "city gate," is glossed by the Northwest Semitic loanword (*ṯġr*>) *šaḫru*[5] (representation of *ġ* by *ḫ* in syllabic script[6]). As a West Semitic loanword in Egyptian, we find *šʿr*[7] and, with metathesis of *ġ*

"New Gate," *ABD,* IV, 1095; idem, "Old Gate," *ABD,* V, 12; idem, "Potsherd Gate," *ABD,* V, 427; idem, "Shallechet Gate," *ABD,* V, 1153-54; idem, "Valley Gate," *ABD,* VI, 784-85; R. A. S. Macalister and J. G. Duncan, *Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, Jerusalem 1923-25. Annual of the Palestine Exploration Fund* 4 (1926); W. H. Mare, "Benjamin Gate," *ABD,* I, 673; B. Mazar, *Mountain of the Lord* (Eng. tr. Garden City, 1975); B. and E. Mazar, *Excavations in the South of the Temple Mount. Qedem* 29 (1989); E. Mazar, "Royal Gateway to Ancient Jerusalem Uncovered," *BAR* 15/3 (1989) 38-51; H. G. Mitchell, "The Wall of Jerusalem According to the Book of Nehemiah," *JBL* 22 (1903) 85-163; M. Oeming, "Zur Topographie und Archäologie Jerusalems," in A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 180-94; E. Otto, *Jerusalem* (Stuttgart, 1980); idem, "Jerusalem," *RLA,* V, 278-81; idem, "Jerusalem," in E. Fahlbusch et al., eds., *Encyclopedia of Christianity,* III (Eng. tr. Grand Rapids, 2003), 17-20; L. B. Paton, "The Meaning of the Expression 'Between the Two Walls,'" *JBL* 25 (1906) 1-13; B. Pixner, D. Chen, and S. Margalit, "Mount Zion: The 'Gate of the Essenes' Re-excavated," *ZDPV* 105 (1989) 85-95; O. Procksch, "Das Jerusalem Jesajas," *PJ* 26 (1930) 12-40; R. Reich, "Four Notes on Jerusalem," *IEJ* 37 (1987) 158-67; P. Riessler, "Die Tore und Mauern Jerusalems unter Nehemias," *BZ* 4 (1906) 347-56; C. Schick, "Nehemia's Mauerbau in Jerusalem," *ZDPV* 14 (1891) 41-62; idem, "Recent Excavations at Shiloah 2," *PEFQS* 1890, 258-59; idem, "Das Thaltor im alten Jerusalem," *ZDPV* 13 (1890) 31-36; H. Shanks, *The City of David* (Washington, 1973); Y. Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David I, 1978-1982. Qedem* 19 (1984); J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the OT* (Leiden, 1952); G. St. Claire, "Nehemiah's Night Ride," *PEFQS* 1888, 46-48; idem, "Nehemiah's Wall," *PEFQS* 1890, 47-50, 212; idem, "The Valley Gate and the Dung Gate," *PEFQS* 1897, 69-70; M. Steiner, "A Note on the Iron Age Defence Wall on the Ophel Hill of Jerusalem," *PEQ* 118 (1986) 27-32; A. D. Tushingham, *Excavations in Jerusalem 1961-1967,* I (Toronto, 1985); idem, "The Western Hill of Jerusalem," *Levant* 19 (1987) 137-43; D. Ussishkin, "The Original Length of the Siloam Tunnel in Jerusalem," *Levant* 8 (1976) 82-95; L.-H. Vincent, *Jérusalem sous terre* (London, 1911); idem, "Les murs de Jérusalem d'après Néhémie," *RB* 13 (1904) 56-74; idem and M.-A. Steve, *Jérusalem de l'AT,* I (Paris, 1954); E. Vogt, "Das Wachstum des alten Stadtgebietes von Jerusalem," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 337-58; R. Weill, *La Cité de David,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1920-47); R. Wenning and E. Zenger, "Die verschiedenen Systeme der Wassernutzung im südlichen Jerusalem und die Bezugnahme darauf in biblischen Texten," *UF* 14 (1982) 279-94; P. Welten, "Jerusalem I. AT," *TRE,* XVI (1987), 590-609; H. G. M. Williamson, "Nehemiah's Walls Revisited," *PEQ* 116 (1984) 81-88; T. F. Wright, "The Valley Gate and the Dung Gate," *PEFQS* 1896, 342; E. M. Yamauchi, "The Archaeological Background of Ezra," *BSac* 137 (1980) 195-211; idem, "The Archaeological Background of Nehemiah," ibid., 291-309.

1. *BLe,* §61k′.
2. *WUS,* no. 2914; Whitaker, *Concordance,* 646.
3. *UT,* 30.
4. EA 244:15-16.
5. *CAD,* XVII/1, 100.
6. W. H. von Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit. AOAT* 40 (1991), 325.
7. *WbÄS,* IV, 421; cf. W. F. Albright, *Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. AOS* 5 (1934), 38: *ša-ʿa-ra.*

and *r, šrʿ*.[8] In Moabite the word appears in the Mesha Stele[9] in the form *šʿryh* (pl. with fem. sg. suf.).[10] The shift of *t* to *š* is regular.[11] The noun appears in Phoenician and Punic as *šʿr*.[12]

In Aramaic the *ġ/r* metathesis is embodied in the nominal forms (*tarᵉǵ* >) *taraʿ*,[13] emph. *tarʿāʾ*, anarthrous *tᵉraʿ*, attested from Imperial Aramaic[14] through Biblical Aramaic (Dnl. 2:49; 3:26) down to Jewish Aramaic;[15] Syr. *tarʿā*, "gate, door, courtyard, palace; chapter, strophe";[16] and the Aramaic derivative *tārāʿ*, "gatekeeper" (Ezr. 7:24). Other derivatives of *ṯġr*, finally, include OSA *ṯʿr*, "gate";[17] Arab. *ṯaġr*, "mouth, harbor"; *ṯuġra*, "opening, cleft."[18]

The noun *ṯġr* is cognate with the vb. (**ṯġr* > *ṯġr* >) Syr. *tᵉraʿ*, "cleave"; Arab. *ṯaġara*, "break up, destroy"; and Eth. *saʿara/šeʿera*, "slash, destroy";[19] as well as Akk. *šaʾāru(m)* II, "conquer, annihilate."[20] No nouns corresponding to *ṯġr* occur in Akkadian or Ethiopic. Instead, Akkadian uses *bābu(m)* (Arab. *bāb*), *abullu(m)*, "gate"; and Ethiopic uses *ḫōhet*, *ʾanqaṣ(ḍ)*, *dēdē*, or *barr*.[21] This evidence is insufficient[22] to disprove the connection between the noun and the vb. *ṯġr;* it does, however,[23] call into question a direct derivation of the appellative from the verb.

A homonymous Hebrew root *šʿr*, "calculate," appears in the OT as a verb in Prov. 23:7[24] and as a noun meaning "measure" (pl. *šᵉʿārîm*) in Gen. 26:12.[25] (An inscription on an Iron II.A jar from Kinnereth reads *kd hšʿr*, "measuring jar."[26]) In Middle Hebrew the vb. *šʿr* (piel), "distribute, measure, calculate," and the nouns *šaʿar*, "estimate, mea-

---

8. *WbÄS*, IV, 528.

9. *KAI* 181.22.

10. *KAI*, II, 177; K. P. Jackson, "The Language of the Mesha Inscription," in A. Dearman, ed., *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab. Archaeology and Biblical Studies* 2 (Atlanta, 1989), 118: *šaʿrêha*.

11. W. R. Garr, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine 1000–586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia, 1985), 28-30.

12. *DISO*, 315.

13. *ATTM*, 108.

14. *ATTM*, 728.

15. *DISO*, 335.

16. *CSD*, 621.

17. Biella, 548-49.

18. Wehr, 103.

19. *LexLingÄth*, 390.

20. *AHw*, 1118.

21. *LexLingÄth*, 606, 649, 1128; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 107.

22. Contra *HAL*, II, 1614.

23. With *HAL*, II, 1614, contra *GesB*[17], 854; *KBL*[1], 1001.

24. J. Gray, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 266; *HAL*, II, 1613-14; for a different view see K. L. Barker, *JANES* 19 (1989) 3-8. On the interpretation of the text see D. Römheld, *Wegeder Weisheit. BZAW* 184 (1989), 32-33.

25. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 421-22; Midr. Gen. Rab. and Tg. Onq. on Gen. 26:12.

26. Fritz, *Kinnereth*, 116-17.

sure, market price"; *šiʿûr/šîʿûr,* "quantity, limit," are widely attested.[27] The original form of the root is represented by Ugar. *ṯʿr* II, "measure, arrange."[28] In Jewish Aramaic we find the vb. *šʿr* (pael), "measure, calculate," and the nouns *šaʿᵃrāʾ,* "market price"; *šiʿûrāʾ/šîʿûrāʾ,* "quantity, limit,"[29] as well as the pl. *šaʿᵃrîm* (from **šaʿar* II), "interest."[30] In Arabic there is a noun *siʿr,* "price," and a denominative vb. *saʿara* II, "set a price"; the root appears also in the Egyptian loanword *šaʿr(a),* "calculate, speculate" (but cf. *sʿr* III), as well as in Demotic and Coptic.[31] The line between *šʿr* II and the allophonic Hebrew root *sʿr* III (< Heb. *śʿr;* Middle Heb. *sʿr*)[32] is historically fluid.

The derivation of the Jewish Aramaic instances of *šʿr* II as Hebrew loanwords from *šʿr* I[33] is contradicted by the two distinct Ugaritic lexemes *ṯǵr* and *ṯʿr,* which cannot reasonably be traced to a common root. The historical association of the Hebrew lexemes from *šʿr* I with Ugar. *ṯǵr* also contradicts the treatment of these lexemes as shaphel forms of *ʿrh* (piel).[34]

There is, however, an Akkadian analogy that would support semantic interweaving of the lexemes from *šʿr* I and II. Besides the Akkadian lexeme *bābtu(m)* I, "ward (of a city), family association,"[35] there is also *bābtu(m)* II, "merchandise (to be delivered), loss, deficit." Whereas *AHw*[36] assigns the semantic spectrum of *bābtu(m)* to two homonymous lemmas, saying that their relationship is unclear, *CAD*[37] enters the whole spectrum under a single lemma, since Sum. DAG.GI$_4$.A represents *bābtu(m)* I and II.[38] Personal property may include money *(kaspum),* real assets ([grain in] a silo, *našpakum*), and goods awaiting delivery *(bābtum).*[39] The gate is marketplace, bank, and bourse, so that *bābtum* can also denote the opposite of cash and property in hand.[40] Akk. *abullu(m)* denotes both the gate and the tax collected there.[41] Egyp. *sbꜣ* and *rꜣ,* "door, gate,"[42] also mean "possessions."[43] "Gate" and "market price" go together, since

27. Jastrow, 1565, 1612.

28. *WUS,* no. 2913; Whitaker, *Concordance,* 646. The words *ꜣḫh yṯʿr mšrrm* (root: *šrr*) appear in *KTU* 1.24, 35f.; cf. W. Herrmann, *Yariḫ und Nikkal und der Preis der Kuṯarāt-Göttlinen. BZAW* 106 (1968), 19-20; M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, *UF* 7 (1975) 207; W. G. E. Watson, *UF* 10 (1978) 401.

29. Jastrow, 1565, 1612.

30. Jastrow, 1613.

31. For all these see A. Murtonen, *Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting,* I/Bb-E (Leiden, 1989), 432 (*šʿr* II).

32. Ibid., 433; *HAL,* II, 1344.

33. *GesB*[17], 854, citing H. Zimmern.

34. Proposed by C. J. Labuschagne, "Original Shaphʿel-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OT Studies. OTWSA* 10 (1971), 59.

35. See II.1 below.

36. *AHw,* I, 94-95.

37. *CAD,* II, 9-14.

38. *CAD,* II, 14.

39. *CT,* 33, 39, 2.

40. Walther, 65 n. 2.

41. *CAD,* A/1, 87.

42. R. Grieshammer, *LexÄg,* V, 223.

43. Königsberger, 1.

the price of merchandise is negotiated at the gate.[44] Standard measures[45] are posted at the gate. Gates are often built according to fixed measurements (cf. Ezk. 40:5-46).[46] Gates, units of measurement, and market prices are intimately associated; to the ancient mind, this association was further underlined by the paretymological homonymy.

II. Semantics.

1. *Akkadian.* Semantic aspects that Hebrew combines in the lexeme *šaʿar* (I) are differentiated in Akkadian by the lexemes *bābu(m)/(abullu*[*m*]) and *bābtu(m).* Analysis of these lexemes also sheds light on the semantic spectrum of *šaʿar.* The word *bābu(m)* denotes the entrance (gate) and door of a building or district, especially a temple or palace, as well as the gate of a city.[47] From this usage, it comes to denote a local district within a city, associated with a gate, as well as the persons who live in that district;[48] cf. *ina pān bīti u bābi,* "before household and community."[49] The theophorous city name Kadingirra$^{\mathbf{ki}}$ = *bābilu* ("Gate of God")[50] refers not only to the city of Babylon but also to a district in which four temples were located.[51]

From *bābu(m)* is derived *bābtu(m),* which can also denote an urban ward[52] but generally means "neighborhood,"[53] placing more emphasis on the community of people living in the district. Oppenheim finds the meaning of *bābtu(m)* grounded in the administration of the district, which is located at the gate, where the citizens assemble on public occasions.[54] But *bābtu(m)* refers primarily to an association.[55] One text names 17 individuals who belong to a *bābtum.*[56] The Old Babylonian "Amorite List" names 29 Amorites who live in five *bābtū.*[57] Each of the *bābtū* bears a personal name, suggesting associations of individuals. The Old Babylonian list of families Kish 1056 shows that in Mesopotamian cites of the 2d millennium, the population was organized as extended families or clans called *bābtū.*[58]

These family associations could also have legal functions.[59] In legal texts *bābtu(m)* can denote a board before which *(ina bābtim)* hearings were held, as in the Code of Hammurabi:[60] *bābta-šu utebber . . . bābta-šu ubār-šu-ma . . . ana bābti-šu inaddin,* "he

44. M. Streck, *VAB* 7/2 (1916), 76, IX, 49.
45. *CAD,* XI/1, 368.
46. R. B. Y. Scott, *BA* 22 (1959) 26; Milson.
47. *AHw,* I, 95.
48. *CAD,* II, 23.
49. Maqlû, IV, 67; G. Meier, *BAfO* 2 (1967), 31.
50. N. Schneider, *Die Götternamen von Ur III. AnOr* 19 (1939), 110; E. Unger, *RLA,* I, 333.
51. Unger, *RLA,* I, 343.
52. *AHw,* I, 94.
53. *CAD,* II, 10.
54. A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), 115-16.
55. K. A. Kamp and N. Yoffee, *BASOR* 237 (1980) 85-104, esp. 94.
56. *TCL,* 1, 189, 19.
57. I. J. Gelb, *JAOS* 88 (1968) 39-46.
58. V. Donbaz and N. Yoffee, *Old Babylonian Texts from Kish* (Malibu, 1986), 57-69.
59. Locher, 300-303.
60. §126.

accuses his clan/neighborhood . . . his clan/neighborhood convicts him . . . he shall pay his clan/neighborhood."[61] The pronominal suffixes underline the close association of the delinquent with his *bābtum.*

The *mārū bābtim* in a document from Dilbat should also be interpreted as such an association of persons.[62] The dispute over the boundary of a piece of real estate is to be decided not in the presence of "gate people,"[63] but in the setting of the gentilic association. In another document,[64] similarly, the elders are to assemble with the *mārū bābtim,* the men of a gentilic association.

The noun *bābtu(m)* is a feminine derivative of *bābu(m)* with a *t* infix;[65] it is a collective noun[66] denoting an association of persons, a subdivision of the population of a city ward (*bābu*[*m*]), which in 2d-millennium Mesopotamia could still be structured gentilically. The semantic aspects associated with different lexemes in Akkadian are brought together in Hebrew in the term *ša'ar;* the distinctions must be identified by contextual analysis, with the presence of a pronominal suffix being an important indicator.

The use of the gate of the royal palace *(bāb ekallim bāb šarri)* as an administrative center leads in Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian to the meaning "court, government."[67]

2. *The Lexeme.* Heb. *ša'ar,* "gate," denotes in the first instance an entrance to a building, a conspicuous architectural feature in a facade with a defensive or an esthetic purpose. Such a gate may also appear in the wall surrounding the grounds of a temple, a palace, or an urban settlement.[68] By synecdoche, *ša'ar* can denote the entirety of a ward or city. Symbolically, it can take on connotations of strength and power. Used literally, *ša'ar* is a particularization of the more general lexeme *peṯaḥ,*[69] "entrance." While *peṯaḥ (bêṯ)* can denote the entrance to an ordinary house (Dt. 22:21) or the public structure of a temple (1 K. 6:31; Ezk. 41:17,20) or palace (2 S. 11:9; 1 K. 14:27), or even a city gate (1 K. 17:10), *ša'ar* is not used for the entrance to a domestic building, which generally is architecturally inconspicuous.[70] More specifically than *peṯaḥ,* it denotes the architecturally conspicuous entrance to a public building or the structural complex marking the entrance to urban wards, towns, and cities.

In Jgs. 18:16-17 *peṯaḥ hašša'ar* denotes the entrance area of the gate to a multiple-family area inhabited by the extended family, *bêṯ mîḵâ* (v. 13), living together as nu-

61. For a different interpretation see R. Borger, *TUAT,* I/1, 58: "council"; but cf. the Code of Eshnunna, §§54,56,58.

62. *VAS,* VII, 16; cf. M. Schorr, *VAB,* 5 (1913), 279.

63. Walther, 64-65.

64. *VAS,* VII, 56; cf. Walther, 61-62, 66-67.

65. *AHw,* I, 94.

66. *GaG,* §60.

67. Cf. *CT,* 22, 101, 14: *ša ina bāb šarri,* "royal official."

68. → עִיר *'îr.*

69. → פתח *pāṯaḥ.*

70. See the survey by F. Braemer, *L'architecture domestique du Levant à l'Age du fer* (1982), 130-33.

clear families in several *bāṯîm.*[71] In Dt. 6:9 and 11:20 the city gate *(šᵉʿāreyḵā)* is distinguished from the entrance to an ordinary house *(mᵉzûzōṯ bêṯeḵā).*

The noun *šaʿar* denotes the gates of the courts of the first and second Jerusalem temples (2 K. 15:35; Jer. 7:2; 20:2; 26:10; 36:10; Ezk. 8:3,14; 9:2; 10:19; 11:1; 40:20-37; 44:1-3; 1 Ch. 26:12-16);[72] in Ezk. 40:48 it denotes the entrance to the temple building itself. In Ps. 24:7,9, the gates of the outer court of the temple are addressed and summoned to adoration (*śᵉʾû šᵉʿārîm rāʾšêḵem*).

Heb. *nśʾ rōʾš* denoting a gesture of attention and rejoicing is paralleled by Ugar. *nšʾ rīš (šu/tšu ilm rʾštkm/-hm;*[73] *nši riš ḫrṯm)* and Akk. *rēša našû*[74] (cf. also *rēša šuqqû*[75]). The *rāʾšîm* are not parts of the gate[76] or watchtowers upon the gates.[77] Just as in Old Babylonian usage a temple can be called upon to lift up its head (*bītum lu naši rēššû,* "let the temple raise its head"[78]), so in Ps. 24:7,9 this summons is addressed to the personified gates of the temple (cf. Isa. 14:31). The gates in their adoration represent by synecdoche the entire sanctuary.[79]

Ps. 15 and 24 preserve petitions asking admittance at the outer gates as places of prayer.[80] These gates separate the outer court of the temple (1 K. 7:9,12) from an inner court (1 K. 6:36; 7:12; Jer. 36:10)[81] and may be identified with the *šaʿᵃrê ṣeḏeq* and the *šaʿar lᵉyhwh* in Ps. 118:19-20.[82] But just as 118:22 uses the technical architectural term *rōʾš pinnâ,* "cornerstone," metaphorically, so too the *šaʿᵃrê ṣeḏeq* as *šaʿar lᵉyhwh* have metaphorical connotations that go beyond the literal meaning: they mark the transition from affliction to full life, from lament to thanksgiving. Faithful solidarity with the community *(ṣeḏeq)* is the way to Yahweh, who brings deliverance. A topographical distinction between the *šaʿᵃrê ṣeḏeq* and the *šaʿar lᵉyhwh* in 118:19-20[83] is otiose.

Reflecting the architecture of the Second Temple in Jerusalem,[84] supplements to P in Ex. 27:9-18a and 38:9-20 describe the tabernacle as being surrounded by a court, with access through a *šaʿar heḥāṣēr* on the east side, decked with curtains like the court itself (Ex. 27:16; 35:17; 38:18; 39:40; 40:8,33; Nu. 4:26).[85]

---

71. L. E. Stager, *BASOR* 260 (1985) 18-23.

72. Busink, I, 143-51; II, 713-30; 827-38; 1178-87.

73. *KTU* 1.2, I, 27, 29.

74. Gilg XII, 149-50; EA 7:17; 11:27.

75. W. G. Lambert, *Iraq* 27 (1965) 5, II, 11, 20-21.

76. C. Warren, *Excavations at Jerusalem* (London, 1871), 111: "cataracta, portcullis"; for other proposed identifications see H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 314.

77. M. I. Gruber, *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East. StPohl* 12, 2 vols. (1980), II, 600-607, citing Akk. *rēšān* (dual), "double battlements," as a motif in royal inscriptions.

78. *JRAS Centenary Sup* (1924), pl. 9, vo. VI, 25, 27.

79. Kapelrud, 152.

80. See V.2 below.

81. Otto, *Jerusalem,* 54.

82. Beyerlin, 94-97; see V.2 below.

83. Kraus, *ZDPV* 75:131-32.

84. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt,* 164-65.

85. The function of the temple gates is discussed in V.2 below.

In the preexilic period, officials called "keepers of the threshold" *(šōmᵉrê hassap)* were associated with the temple gates (2 K. 12:10[Eng. 9]; 22:4; 23:4; 25:18; Jer. 35:4; 52:24; 1 Ch. 9:19; 2 Ch. 34:9). It was their job to deposit monetary offerings at the entrance to the temple (2 K. 12:10[9]; 22:4; 2 Ch. 34:9). In the postexilic period this office may have been linked with liturgical functions at the temple gates.[86] In this period they and the "doorkeepers" *(šōʿᵃrîm bassippîm)* were among the gatekeepers *(šōʿᵃrîm)* of the temple.[87]

The word *ša'ar* is also used for entrances to palace complexes. In Jer. 22:2,4 *(šaʿᵃrê habbayiṯ hazzeh), ša'ar* refers to the gate of the king's palace in Jerusalem (cf. the two-chamber palace gate on the Ophel in Jerusalem, dating from the Iron II.C period[88]). In 2 K. 11 the text mentions a "runners' gate" (*ša'ar hārāṣîm,* v. 19) and a "horse gate" (*ša'ar sûs,* v. 6)[89] as entrances to the palace precincts. In 2 Ch. 23:15 and Neh. 3:28 the latter is called *ša'ar hassûsîm.* Jer. 31:40 mentions a gate with this name as part of the fortifications on the east side of Jerusalem. Galling distinguishes between the city gate called the "horse gate" and a temple gate called the "rock gate" (*ša'ar ṣûr,* 2 K. 11:6 [NRSV: the gate Sur]).[90] Gunneweg distinguishes the entrance to the palace (2 K. 11:6) from a "horse gate" on the north side of the temple precincts.[91] But this view conflicts with 2 Ch. 23:15. A horse gate leading into the temple is hard to imagine. The "horse gate" should be interpreted as a palace gate that was not incorporated into the postexilic defenses of Jerusalem *(mēʿal ša'ar-hassûsîm).*[92]

In 2 K. 9:31 *ša'ar* refers to the gate of the palace in Samaria; cf. also the four-chamber gate 1567 of the court of palace 1723 at Megiddo and the six-chamber gate of the palace at Lachish (both Iron II.B).

The palace entrances were guarded by bodyguards (*haššōmᵉrîm peṯaḥ bêṯ hammeleḵ,* 1 K. 14:27), who controlled all forms of access to the palace; their duties were therefore not limited to the gate. This function links them with the *šōmēr hašša'ar* of the temple precincts (Neh. 3:29; cf. 1 Ch. 26:1-19)[93] and distinguishes them from the *šōʿēr* (2 S. 18:26; 2 K. 7:10) of the city gate.[94] The office of "guardian of the threshold" *(šōmēr hassap),* one of the high officials of the royal court (2 K. 25:18; Jer. 52:24), was connected with the entrance to the king's throne room (Est. 2:21). In Est. 4:2,6, *ša'ar hammeleḵ* refers literally to the entrance to the palace; in 2:19,21; 5:9, it refers to the entrance to the official area, distinct from the king's private chambers;[95] cf. the distinction in Akkadian between *bābānu,* "part of a gate, public area,"[96] and *bītānu,*

86. M. Oeming, *Das wahre Israel. BWANT* 128 (1990), 203.
87. J. W. Wright.
88. E. and B. Mazar, *Excavations,* 13-28, 58-60.
89. E. Würthwein, *Könige II: 1.Kön. 17–2.Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 344 n. 5.
90. *PJ* 27:52.
91. Gunneweg, *Nehemia,* 72.
92. See IV below.
93. J. W. Wright.
94. See also Salonen, 125ff.
95. Loretz.
96. *CAD,* II, 7a.

"inner quarters."[97] In Est. 3:2-3; 5:13; 6:10, *šaʿar hammeleḵ* is used figuratively for the seat of government, as a term for the royal household, including both domestic staff and officials.[98] In Dnl. 2:49 *weḏānîyēʾl biṯeraʿ malkāʾ* means that Daniel belongs to the royal court. Behind this use of *šaʿar hammeleḵ/teraʿ malkāʾ* in Est. 3:2-3 and Dnl. 2:49 stands Neo-Bab. and Late Bab. *bāb šarri,* possibly mediated through Persian.

There is also an Egyptian parallel: *ʿryt,* "watch; gate structure through which one enters the royal palace,"[99] which played a role in the administration of justice and general government.[100]

Prov. 14:19, illustrating the dependence of consequences on actions, states that the wicked must bow down at the gates of the righteous *(šaʿarê ṣaddîq).* The plural suggests a palace[101] whose gates metaphorically symbolize strength, power, and impregnability.

The fortifying function of securing the entrance to a building or district is particularly clear in the use of the lexeme *šaʿar* to denote the gate of a fortress (*šaʿarê habbîrâ,* Neh. 2:8; cf. 7:2).[102]

The fortifying function of a gate also comes to the fore in the use of *šaʿar* to denote the gate complex of a fortified city or town. In Gen. 23:10,18; 34:20,24; Dt. 22:24; Josh. 8:29; 20:4; Jgs. 9:35,44; 16:2,3; 2 K. 23:8; Jer. 17:24; Ezk. 48:31; 2 Ch. 32:6, *šaʿar* is combined in a construct phrase with → עִיר *ʿîr* to denote a settlement defended by walls; in Dt. 21:19 it is combined with → מָקוֹם *māqôm* to express the same meaning. In Gen. 19:1 (Sodom); 1 S. 17:52 (Ekron); Jer. 1:15; 17:19,21,24,27; 22:19; Mic. 1:12; Lam. 4:12; Neh. 7:3; 13:19 (Jerusalem); Ps. 9:15[14]; 87:2 ([daughter] Zion, referring to Jerusalem), *šaʿar* is combined with a city name. In these combinations the gate, an outstanding feature, stands by synecdoche for the settlement as a whole.

When *šaʿar* appears in combination with elements of the gate, we meet the semantic aspect of *šaʿar* as a gate structure in its poliorcetic complexity.[103] The phrase *tôḵ haššaʿar* (2 S. 9:18) denotes the interior of the structure, which can consist of two to six chambers;[104] the phrase *gag haššaʿar* (2 S. 18:24) denotes the roof of the gate.[105] The phrase *ʿalîyaṯ haššaʿar* (2 S. 19:1[18:33]) refers to the upper chamber of the gate, especially of a gate tower. (Egyptian and Assyrian representations of Syro-Palestinian gates

97. *CAD,* II, 274-75; cf. also Heinrich, *Paläste,* 186-87.

98. See Wehr, who cites Xenophon *Cyropedia* 7.5.25: *hai pýlai hai toú basileíou* and Turk. *bāb-i-ʿālī,* "the high gate"; cf. also Ahiqar 3.44; 1.9; 2.17 (*AP,* 212-13): *trʿ hyklʾ/bb hyklʾ.*

99. W. Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs* (1958), 65.

100. See V.2 below.

101. A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), I, 238.

102. Otto, *Jerusalem,* 106, 137-38. On the gates of the Arad fortress see Herzog et al., *BASOR* 254; Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1981), 7-8, 10; on the gates of the fortress at Tell el-Kheleifeh see Pratico, 13-14, with ills. 10-11.

103. For Palestine see Herzog, *Stadttor,* 157-60; for Mesopotamia see Damerji, 259-85, and passim; for the Hellenistic and Roman period see Lawrence, 246-72; Brands, 49-68.

104. See III below.

105. Biran (*IEJ* 34:12, fig. 8) reconstructs the roof of the four-chamber gate at Dan, almost 25 feet high, as a flat roof; on the technique of constructing gate roofs, see also Gregori, 92-93; Naumann, 158-59.

from without[106] depict windows above the lintel; stairs have been found in gates, e.g., level IV/III at Timna [Tell el-Batashi].)[107] The phrases *peṯaḥ (haššaʿar)* (Jgs. 9:35,40,44; 16:2; 2 S. 10:8; 11:3; 2 K. 7:3; 10:8; 23:8; Isa. 8:29; 20:4; etc.) and *meḇôʾ haššaʿar* (2 Ch. 23:15) refer to the entranceway and interior of the gate, *dalṯôṯ-haššaʿar* to the leaves set into the gate,[108] which in the Iron Age was always open into the town. Egyptian representations of Syro-Palestinian gates during the Late Bronze Age always depict a horizontal lintel;[109] Assyrian representations from the Iron Age, by contrast, depict an arch or a straight lintel.[110] The hinges were covered by pilasters or wales in the outward-facing entranceway, to prevent the leaves and their hinges from being prised out. That could be accomplished only by smashing the doorposts (*mezûzôṯ* [*haššaʿar*], Jgs. 16:3; cf. Ezk. 45:19; 46:2).

The leaves of the Iron Age gate at Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh) were made of cypress and pine, those of the gate at Lachish of acacia reinforced with bronze fittings.[111] The term *sap haššaʿar* (Ezk. 40:6-7; cf. Zeph. 2:14) denotes the outward-facing horizontal stone beneath the gate leaves, in which the pivots (*ʾammôṯ*, Isa. 6:4) were set (cf. Akk. *sippu*[*m*], "doorjamb,"[112] also used in the sense of "gate entranceway": *ina sippi bābāni*[113]). Zwickel differentiates between *sap* and *miptan*, the former denoting the outer threshold, the latter the inner threshold. The phrase *miptan haššaʿar* (Ezk. 46:2) means the threshold of the gate.[114]

The terms *berîaḥ (haššaʿar)* (Jgs. 16:3; Ps. 147:13; Neh. 3:3,6,13-15) and *manʿûlê (haššaʿar)* (Neh. 3:3,6,13-15; cf. 1 Mc. 9:50) refer to the bars and crossbars of the gate. The bars of a gate might be sliding horizontal beams set in a slot in the wall, as in the gate at Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh); vertical beams thrust into a hole in the threshold, as in the gates at Dor and Carchemish; or beams propped diagonally against each leaf and supported by a stone or metal footing in the floor of the entranceway, as in the gates at Lachish and Tell Halaf.[115] The bars could be put in place to secure the gate at night.[116] In Isa. 45:1 *delāṯayim* and *šeʿārîm* are used together pleonastically: "doors and gates" represent all forms of access to sovereignty.

The phrase *dereḵ haššaʿar* (2 S. 15:2; Ezk. 9:2; etc.) refers to the road leading to the gate, often enclosed by walls to impede the approach of enemies (as in the case of the Iron Age gates at Dan, Megiddo, and Beer-sheba).

---

106. Naumann, 310-19; see also Porada, 6.

107. Kelm and Mazar, *BASOR* 248:22, 24.

108. Salonen, 15, 52ff.; Damerji, 181-88.

109. Naumann, 311-15.

110. Ibid., 315-19.

111. D. Ussishkin, *TAJ* 5 (1978) 61, with pl. 20,2.

112. *AHw*, II, 1049; cf. P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2 (1970) 335 n. 2.

113. S. Langdon, *VAB* 4 (1912), 72, ll. 19-22; etc. See W. Baumgartner, "Untersuchungen zu den akkadischen Bauausdrücken," *ZA* 36 (1925) 27.

114. Herzog, *Stadttor*, 90-98, 110, etc.; cf. also Naumann, 160-69; Damerji, 140-54.

115. See also Naumann, 169-71; Damerji, 242-58.

116. H. Otten, *FS E. Heinrich. BaghM* 3 (1964) 91-95; Brunner, *Symbolon* 6 (Egyptian temple gates).

The "blueprint" for the new temple in the book of Ezekiel also speaks of *tāʾê haššaʿar,* "recesses, chambers," in the gates of the temple court (Ezk. 40:10)[117] as well as *keṯep (haššaʿar),* the "wall" or "side" of the gate (40:18,44; 46:19). The influence of the temple's architecture is reflected in the expression *ʾûlām haššaʿar,* "vestibule of the gate" (40:7-9,15,39-40; 44:3; 46:2,8).[118]

The words *dāwiḏ yôšēḇ bên-šᵉnê haššᵉʿārîm* in 2 S. 18:24 point to the presence of an outer gate in addition to the main gate; such a complex is found at Iron Age Dan, Megiddo, Lachish, Beer-sheba, Gezer, and Timnah (Tell el-Batashi). An interpretation that has David seated in a gate chamber with front and back doors[119] must postulate an elliptical mode of expression (found, e.g., in Josh. 2:5,7) that shortened *dalṯôṯ haššaʿar* to *haššaʿar.* Against this interpretation stands the fact that Iron Age gates had doors only on the outside, not on the interior side.

The gate was a prominent architectural feature of the fortifications that made a settlement an *ʿîr* rather than a village.[120] By synecdoche, therefore, it can represent the city as a whole with its inhabitants. In 1 K. 8:37 and 2 Ch. 6:28, a Dtr list of plagues is expanded to include the enemy that oppresses Israel *bᵉʾereṣ šᵉʿārāyw.* While the plagues of famine, pestilence, etc., affect the entire land, the cities are the primary targets of the enemy's oppression. In Mic. 1:9, in an exilic Samaria-Jerusalem schema, *šaʿar ʿammî* is identified with Jerusalem. Ob. 13 also uses *šaʿar ʿammî* in this sense (cf. Ob. 11,16-17).

In Akkadian the word *bāb(u),* "gate," could have the connotation of a city ward associated with its own gate. Palestinian cities and towns, being on a smaller scale, generally had only a single gate; thus *šaʿar* was used to mean the city as a whole. But just as Akk. *bābu(m)* and *bābtu(m)* could also refer to a community of people living in a ward, organized into gentilic associations, so *šaʿar* could also have the connotation of an association of persons. Ruth 4:10 uses *šaʿar mᵉqômô* in parallel with *ʾeḥāyw.* The emendation of *šaʿar mᵉqômô* to *ʿammô*[121] captures the meaning of the MT *šaʿar mᵉqômô:* the genealogy (*šēm;* cf. Akk. *šumu*[*m*][122]) of the deceased is to be carried on among his brothers and kindred in his dwelling place. In Ruth 3:11 the translation of *šaʿar* as "gate" in *kol-šaʿar ʿammî* makes little sense, so that translations such as "everyone within these walls"[123] and "everyone within the gate of my people"[124] have been proposed. But *ʿammî* refers to the clan (note the suffix)[125] to which the *šaʿar,* like the *bābtu(m)* (in the sense of "extended family"), belongs. The clan is affected by Boaz's intention to take Ruth in marriage; the privileged *gōʾēl* is a member of this clan,

117. W. von Soden, *WO* 1 (1960) 356-61 = *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 12-18; for Iron Ages gate chambers in general see Herzog, *Stadttor,* 125-26, 128.

118. But cf. the derivation of this expression from the esplanade of the city gate by Busink, II, 720.

119. E.g., Frankfort, 286-87.

120. → XI, 54-55.

121. *BHS;* cf. LXX.

122. *AHw,* III, 1274-75.

123. EÜ.

124. E. Zenger, *Ruth. ZBK* 8 (1986), 68.

125. → XI, 169-70.

and Ruth's worth is well known to it. From this sense of *ša'ar* as a gentilic association, Deuteronomy develops a complex system requiring separate treatment.[126]

Like the palace gate, the city gate can take on metaphorical connotations of strength and power when a land is represented by its urban centers. The victory formula *yrš 'ēṯ ša'ar 'ōyeḇāyw,* "possess the gate of their enemies," in Gen. 22:17 and 24:60 suggests the might of the enemies to be vanquished.

Theological meaning attaches to *ša'ar* when it denotes the entrance to the heavenly realm or the netherworld of the dead. In Isa. 38:10 and Sir. 51:9 (cf. also Wis. 16:13), *ša'arê še'ôl* refers to the gates of the netherworld, which is pictured as a city.[127] The motif of the gates of the netherworld is common throughout the ancient Near East. It appears in Mesopotamia, for example, in the mythological narratives of Ishtar's descent into hell (*bāb* KUR.NU.GI$_4$, "the gate of the land of no return")[128] and of Nergal and Ereshkigal.[129] It is also found in Egypt.[130] Similar to the motif of the *ša'arê še'ôl* is that of the *ša'arê māweṯ* in Ps. 9:14(13) and 107:18 and the *ša'arê ṣalmāweṯ* in Job 38:17. Both *māweṯ* and *ṣalmāweṯ* are conceived spatially, as synonyms of *še'ôl* (Job 30:23; Prov. 5:5; cf. Mt. 16:18).[131]

In Gen. 28:17 *ša'ar haššāmayim* (cf. Ps. 78:23) indicates the gate of heaven as the entrance to a heavenly palace. Akk. *abulli šamê,* "gate of heaven"[132] (with reference to the god Ashur), is similar; cf. also *abullī ša šamê rapšūti,* "the gates of the broad heavens."[133] The link between the motif of the gate of heaven and the *sullām* ("ladder to heaven") in Gen. 28:12 is the Mesopotamian ziggurat, a terraced temple.[134] The story of Nergal and Ereshkigal[135] speaks of a *simmiltu* ("stairway") with "the gate of Anu, Enlil, and Ea" at its top.[136] There are many other passages referring to cosmic gates, especially in connection with the sun god Shamash.[137] We also find the expression KA.DINGIR.RA *bābili,* "holy gate."[138] Jacobsen discusses the divinization of the temple gate and the function of the temple as the gateway of the gods in Mesopotamia.[139]

---

126. See II.3 below.

127. N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969), 152-54.

128. *CT* 15, 45, 12 and passim.

129. *STT* I, no. 28, I, 20-26; III, 41-47; cf. EA 357:67-74; cf. also *KAR* 32:20 *(šamaš).*

130. J. Zandee, *Studies in the History of Religion* 5 (1960) 114-25.

131. M. Dahood, *Psalms I. AB* (1966), 38.

132. J. Craig, *Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts. Assyriologische Bibliothek* 13, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885-87), I, 22; II, 15.

133. *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts,* VI, pl. 12, l. 10.

134. W. von Soden, *UF* 3 (1971) 253-63 = *Bibel und Alter Orient,* 134-47.

135. O. R. Gurney, *AnSt* 10 (1960) 105-31.

136. *STT* I, no. 28, IV, 26-27; see Millard, 86-87.

137. *CT* 16, 9, 12; *KAR* 32, 30; Gilg. IX, II, 6 (L. W. King, *Seven Tablets of Creation,* II [1902], pl. 49, 13; cf. I [1902], 126); A. Schollmeyer, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen und Gebete an Šamaš* (1912), no. 16, IV, 14; also *CAD,* I/1, 83, 87; II, 22; III, 55. For Ugaritic see *KTU* 1.78 (Šapšu); see also 1 En. 72:6ff.

138. E. Unger, *RLA,* I, 366.

139. T. Jacobsen, *JNES* 2 (1943) 118-19.

In Egyptian cosmology a boundary separates the roof of heaven from the earthly world. Gates enable the sun god to embark on his daily journey through the heavens in the morning and to enter the realm of the dead in the evening;[140] the same gates enable the departed to enter and escape from the realm of the dead. Through the double doors of their statue shrines and the temple gates connecting the heavenly and earthly realms, deities enter the world in procession.[141] According the Book of the Gates (Ramesside period),[142] the netherworld is divided into twelve regions, with connecting gates *('ȝ, rw.t, śbȝ)* guarded by gatekeepers.[143] Through these gates the sun god passes during the night, but the dead cannot pass. Therefore they get to see the light of the sun for only one hour during the night.[144] The continuation of this life in the next takes place behind a false door.[145]

3. *Deuteronomy.* a. *Pre-Dtn Material.* The pre-Dtn occurrences of *ša'ar* in Dt. 21:19; 22:15,24; 25:7 have no suffix; thus they differ from the Dtn and Dtr occurrences of *šᵉ'āreyḵā/ša'ᵃrêḵem,* which always have a suffix. The pre-Dtn occurrences are limited to the corpus of family laws inserted into chs. 12–26* by the Dtn redactor as part of his reform (21:15-17,18-21a; 22:13-21a,22a,23,24a,25,27-29; 24:1-4a,5; 25:5-10).[146] A consistent conceptual and lexical field is associated with the lexeme *ša'ar* in this corpus. In 21:19; 22:15; 25:7, the elders are associated with the gate as a place where judgment is given.[147]

Dt. 22:24 is elliptical. Unlike 21:18-21a; 22:13-21a; 25:5-10, the text of 22:22-29* does not thematize the judicial procedure. A concise schema, found also in cuneiform law codes,[148] distinguishes the various circumstances surrounding adultery and the differing legal consequences. The delinquents are brought before a court at the gate *(hôṣē'ṯem . . . 'el-ša'ar),* where the differences between adultery and rape laid out in vv. 23-27* are applied to the case before the execution of one or both (v. 24). V. 24 refers to the very opposite of a lynching: it points to an orderly procedure to consider the differing circumstances outlined in vv. 22-29*.

---

140. J. Assmann, *LexÄg,* III, 4; idem, *Der König als Sonnenpriester. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Ägyptologische Reihe* 7 (Glückstadt, 1970) 29-30, 54.

141. Brunner, *Symbolon* 6:39ff., figs. 5 and 6.

142. Text: C. Maystre and A. Piankoff, *Le livre des portes,* I-III (Cairo, 1939-62); trans.: E. Hornung, *Ägyptische Unterweltsbücher* (Zurich, ²1984), 197-308; Eng. tr. in E. A. W. Budge, *The Egyptian Heaven and Hell,* II (London, 1905); bibliog.: W. J. Zandee, "The Book of Gates," *Liber Amicorum. FS C. J. Bleeker* (Leiden, 1969), 282-324.

143. H. Kees, *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der Alten Ägypter* (⁵1983), 289-90.

144. See also K. Koch, *Geschichte der ägyptischen Religion* (Stuttgart, 1993), 398-400, 403.

145. For a discussion of the meaning and function of this door, see Wiebach, 63ff.

146. E. Otto, "Soziale Verantwortung und Reinheit des Landes," in R. Liwak and S. Wagner, eds., *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel. FS S. Herrmann* (Stuttgart, 1991), 290-306.

147. Buchholz, 60-75; contrast Gertz, 154-200, who considers the judicial function of the elders to be an exilic Dtr interpolation into Dt. 19–25.

148. E.g., §§12-16 of tablet A of the Middle Assyrian Laws; E. Otto, "Die Einschränkung des Privatstrafrechts . . . ," in W. Zwickel, ed., *Biblische Welten. FS M. Metzger. OBO* 123 (1993), 131-66.

When someone accused of a transgression is brought to the gate to be judged by the elders, the expression used is *yṣʾ* (hiphil) *ʾel-šaʿar.* When someone goes to the *šaʿar* to seek legal redress before the court of elders, the expression used is *ʿlh šaʿar(â)* (Dt. 25:7; cf. Ruth 4:1).

Several laws in Dt. 21:18-21;[149] 22:13-21a;[150] 25:5-10[151] include procedural stipulations; here the motif of judgment at the *šaʿar* is integral and should not be isolated by literary analysis. In 22:22-29*, too, the *šaʿar* motif is constitutive. All the traditions in these sections reflect legal reforms benefiting those with diminished social and legal power. In 21:18-21a the legal function of the paterfamilias with respect to family members is transferred to the judges at the gate.[152] In 22:13-21a a married woman is protected against a false accusation by her husband charging her with adultery as an inchoative wife.[153] In 22:22-29* a wife is protected against rape by a deterrent threat; if rape should occur, she is protected against the charge of adultery. In 25:5-10 a widow is protected against the loss of her portion if her husband's estate has not been divided.[154]

The family law corpus Dt. 21:15-21a; 22:13-29*; 24:1-5*; 25:5-10 brings together laws originating in urban practice. In 21:19,20; 22:17,18; 25:8, the elders are called *ziqnê hāʿîr (ʿîrô);* in 21:21a and 22:21a, the executors are called *ʾanšê ʿîrô (ʿîrâ).* In 22:22-29* the distinction between commission of an offense *bāʿîr* (vv. 23,24) and *baśśāḏeh* (vv. 25,27) implies an urban perspective, as does the judgment of the case at the *šaʿar hāʿîr* (v. 24). The individual legal traditions included in this family law corpus derive from urban jurisprudence or describe the urban administration of justice and its reform from the perspective of legal reflection. The corpus as a whole is a product of scribal erudition in the cities of preexilic Judah.[155] The Dtn redactor, interpreting and reforming the Covenant Code on the hermeneutical principle of cultic centralization, included this corpus in Dt. 12–26*, adding to the family law of the Covenant Code only the law in Ex. 22:15-16(16-17).[156]

In the perspective of the Dtn and pre-Dtn redaction, the authority exercised by the elders is limited to deciding cases governed by family law; all other cases are decided by local courts presided over by judges and scribes (16:18). In a case of murder by an unknown hand, the elders serve as local representatives in the expiation of the bloodguilt; but they exercise no judicial authority in legal proceedings. The appearance of elders and judges side by side in the Dtn and pre-Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26 is consistent and does not require a late dating of either the judges[157] or the elders[158] as a Dtr

---

149. P. E. Dion, "La procédure d'élimination du fils rebelle," in G. Braulik et al., eds., *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel. FS N. Lohfink* (Freiberg, 1993), 76.

150. Locher, 67.

151. E. Otto, *TLZ* 118 (1993) 509.

152. Dion, "Procédure," 73-82; E. Bellefontaine, *JSOT* 13 (1979) 13-31.

153. Locher, 373-80.

154. On 24:1-4a see E. Otto, *UF* 24 (1992) 301-10.

155. E. Otto, "Town and Rural Countryside in Ancient Israelite Law," *JSOT* 57 (1993) 3-22.

156. E. Otto, *ZAW* 105 (1993) 153-65.

157. Buchholz, 85-100.

158. Gertz, 154-200.

addition to Dt. 19–25 during the exile. The phrase *ša'ar mᵉqōmô* in 21:19 shows that this family law was not formulated from the perspective of the Dtn contrast between *māqôm* and *šᵉ'ārîm,* which is also a given in the Dtr redactions.

b. *Dtn Redaction.* The lexeme *ša'ar* is central to the Dtn and pre-Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26; the use of the 2d person singular suffix in 12:15,17,18,21; 14:21,27,28,29; 15:7,22; 16:5,11,14,18; 17:2,5,8; 18:6; 23:17(16); 24:14; 26:12 (21 [3 × 7] occurrences) distinguishes this usage from the Dtr *ša'ᵃrêḵem* in 12:12.

The central importance of *ša'ar* for the late preexilic Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26* is a result of the lexeme's function in the complex of motifs associated with centralization as the hermeneutical key to the Dtn conceptions of how to interpret existing legal traditions, especially those in the Covenant Code. Drawing on the altar law of the Covenant Code in Ex. 20:24,[159] Dt. 12:13 distinguishes offerings *bᵉḵol-māqôm,* which are forbidden, from the required offerings *bammāqôm* (+ centralization formula). The legitimate alternative to sacrifice *bᵉḵol-māqôm* is noncultic slaughtering *bᵉḵol-šᵉ'āreyḵā* (v. 15), so that we have the following sequence of contrasts: *bᵉḵol-māqôm* (v. 13) — *bammāqôm* (v. 14) — *bᵉḵol-šᵉ'āreyḵā* (v. 15).

As a formula contrasting with *bᵉḵol-māqôm* in v. 13, the phrase *bᵉḵol-šᵉ'āreyḵā* appears only in v. 15 and in the application of the cultic centralization formula to the reform of the judiciary in 16:18. The invariable pl. *šᵉ'āreyḵā* expresses the perspective of an observer at the central sanctuary surveying the many towns scattered throughout the land.

In the ancient Near East and in Israel, a gate is a place of transition from a salubrious, sheltered space to a chaotic and perilous outside world;[160] the city gate is thus a transition from the sheltered space of the walled city to the outside world,[161] a transition that must be made safe by architectural and magical means. The Dtn redaction reverses this perspective. The *šᵉ'ārîm* open on the central sanctuary, the *māqôm* that God has chosen; from it they receive their beneficence and power to sustain life. The land as a whole is a world structured around this sanctuary, under God's sovereignty. This perspective reflects the administrative hierarchy of Jerusalem, the central city, and the rural towns of Judah,[162] now raised to the cultic plane and interpreted cultically. The introductory motif of blessing *bᵉḵol-šᵉ'āreyḵā* in 12:15 makes clear that the *šᵉ'ārîm* are not a profane no-man's-land: they are subject to God's sovereign authority and are viewed in their relationship to the central sanctuary.[163]

The festival calendar in 16:1-17 is framed by *wᵉ-qāṭal* clauses in the Passover legislation of vv. 1-8.[164] These clauses set forth the critical innovations combining Passover

---

159. N. Lohfink, *Bibl* 65 (1984), 318-19 = *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I. SBAB* 12 (1991), 168-69; Levinson, 193-207; Reuter, 123-26.

160. Wiebach, 96-109.

161. → XI, 54-55.

162. → XI, 57-60; see also H. M. Niemann, *Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat. FAT* 6 (1993), 246-72.

163. Levinson, 231-32.

164. → XII, 14-17.

with the Festival of Unleavened Bread, developed in a series of *yiqṭōl* clauses in vv. 3-5. Vv. 2 and 7 require the Passover sacrifice to be offered at the central sanctuary *bammāqôm* (+ centralization formula). This requirement is developed in vv. 4b-6. The words *kî ʾim* contrast the prohibition forbidding offering the Passover sacrifice *beʾaḥaḏ šeʿāreyḵā* (+ gift of the land clause) with the commandment to offer it *bammāqôm*[165] (+ centralization formula). On the assumption that the pre-Dtn Passover was a clan celebration (Ex. 12:21-23),[166] *šaʿar* here (like Akk. *bābtu*[*m*]) has the genealogical connotations of the clan. In the celebration of the three great annual festivals at the central sanctuary, the community of Israel is constituted cultically. During the Festival of Weeks (Dt. 16:9-12)[167] and the Festival of Booths, Israel manifests itself as a festal community of cultic rejoicing *(śmḥ),* which includes the landless (i.e., Levites and strangers) as well as widows and orphans, the classical examples of the dispossessed (v. 11).[168]

It is inappropriate to interpret the cultic centralization that lies behind the dialectic of central sanctuary *(hammāqôm)* and *šeʿārîm* as a secularizing movement.[169] The *šeʿārîm* are linked with the central sanctuary by a "pilgrimage schema" associated with the centralization formula, comprising as its basic elements the festal meal, rejoicing, and the participation of all, including the landless.[170] But it is not just the pilgrimages to the central sanctuary that bless the *šeʿārîm,* but also the doing of God's will to preserve the purity of the land and social responsibility toward the landless. The reason that the Dtn redactor contrasts *šeʿārîm* with *hammāqôm* is not to urbanize Dtn theology by restricting the priestly *beḵol-môšeḇōṯêḵem* (Ex. 12:20; 35:3; etc.) to the cities.[171] Such an interpretation is contradicted not only by the extension of removing leaven *beḵol-geḇuleḵā* (Dt. 16:4a), but also by the command not to defile "your land *(ʾaḏmāṯeḵā)* that Yahweh has given you" (21:23; cf. 24:4) and the command to purge evil from Israel (*biʿartā* formula, 22:22; cf. 19:13; 21:9),[172] and above all by the parallelism of *ʾarṣeḵā* and *šeʿāreyḵā* in 24:14.

In the Dtn theology of Dt. 12–26* the semantic connotations of *šeʿāreyḵā,* which approximate the meaning of Akk. *bābtu(m),* are clear in the integration formula *ʾašer bišeʿāreyḵā.* The cultic integration of the landless into the festival community reflects their inclusion in the *šeʿārîm,* the gentilic associations of clans or extended families in the local towns. The integration formula in 12:18; 14:21,27,29; 16:11,14; (24:14) has its focus in 12:18; 14:27; 16:11, in the integration of *hallēwî ʾašer bišeʿāreyḵā* into the

165. See *BHS.*

166. → XII, 9-14.

167. → XIV, 362-64.

168. G. Braulik, "The Joy of the Feast," *Theology of Deuteronomy* (Eng. tr. North Richland Hills, 1994), 27-65.

169. As is done by M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (1972, repr. Winona Lake, 1992), 233-43; idem, *IEJ* 23 (1973) 230-33. See E. Otto, *Vom Rechtsbruch zur Sünde. JBT* 9 (1994).

170. N. Lohfink, in A. Schenker, ed., *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im AT. FAT* 3 (1992), 25-32.

171. As claimed by Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School,* 229 n. 2.

172. → II, 203.

š^{e}ʿārîm of the local associations. This Dtn redaction has an interest in the Levites in their relationship to the central sanctuary. They are named only in connection with cultic activities and in laws concerning the central sanctuary, but not in the list of the dispossessed in 24:19,21.[173]

In Dt. 12:18, in the regulations governing the tithe, the integration formula is incorporated into the primary commandment. The Levites are to share in the consumption of the tithe at the central sanctuary. Here the motifs of integrating the landless Levites into the cultic community and feeding the hungry are combined. Among the laws defining Yahweh's prerogatives, regulations stipulating what must be set apart for him appear in 14:22–15:23*; 26:2-13*. Here 14:27 repeats the formulation of the primary commandment, in order to apply it to the provisions made for the triennial tithe (v. 29). In each case the regulations are justified by the landlessness of the Levites *biš^{e}ʿāreyḵā.*

The relationship between the Levites *biš^{e}ʿāreyḵā* and the *kōh^{a}nîm hall^{e}wîyim* is defined in 18:6. The latter come *mēʾaḥaḏ š^{e}ʿāreyḵā* and are allowed to function in association with the central sanctuary and at the central court (17:9; 18:6-7).[174] The language does not constitute an identification formula.[175] Neither should *kōh^{a}nîm hall^{e}wîyim* be excised as literarily secondary, on the grounds that only a single chosen *kōhēn* is mentioned in 18:3b,4,5*.[176] The function of the support system in 18:1-8* is defined by its context, the judicial system established in 16:18–18:8*. The core of this passage is 17:2-13*, which regulates the exercise of judicial authority. This core is framed by laws governing the personnel of the local and central courts in 16:18-19* and 18:1-8.[177] The *kōh^{a}nîm hall^{e}wîyim* serve on the central court (17:9); when they function in this role, they have the authority of a *kōhēn hāʿōmēd l^{e}šāreṯ šām ʾeṯ-yhwh* (v. 12). Therefore they are to be supported like the priests (18:1-8*), so that they are not dependent on the annual and triennial tithes like the Levites *biš^{e}ʿāreyḵā.* Only in the Dtr texts 17:18; 24:18; 27:9 are the priests and Levites treated as identical cultic functionaries.

In Dt. 16:14 the integration formula *ʾ^{a}šer biš^{e}ʿāreyḵā* is extended from the Levites to the list of the dispossessed — strangers, widows, and orphans. In this regulation the dispossessed are distinguished from members of the family, who are characterized as a unit by the 2d person singular suffix. Instead, the dispossessed are assigned to the *šaʿar* of the landowners, to whom the regulation is addressed. In 14:29 (cf. 26:12), similarly, the integration formula is associated with the dispossessed, and the regulations governing the triennial tithe are extended to include them.

Each case involves the *šaʿar* of the "you" (sg.) addressed by the text, within which reside the persons whose common bond is their landless status and the fact that as wid-

---

173. Reuter, 141.

174. G. E. Wright, *VT* 4 (1954) 325-30; R. Abba, *VT* 27 (1977) 257-67.

175. U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde. BBB* 65 (1987), 69; contra A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester. FRLANT* 89 (1965), 130.

176. Contra Rüterswörden, *Gemeinschaft,* 72.

177. E. Otto, "Deuteronomistische Gestaltung und deuteronomistische Interpretation im 'Ämtergesetz,'" in I. Kottsieper et al., eds., *"Wer ist wie du, Herr, unter den Göttern?" FS O. Kaiser* (Göttingen, 1994), 142-55.

ows, orphans, and strangers they have lost the vital ties of genealogy.[178] Like the suffixes in the list of members of the nuclear family and their slaves in 12:18; 16:11,14, the suffix added to *šaʿar* in the integration formula shows clearly that this lexeme, like Akk. *bābtu(m),*[179] has not only a local connotation but also a genealogical connotation, in the sense of "clan" or "extended family" (cf. Ruth 3:11; 4:10). The landless and their families need to be integrated into the clans. From this integration arises the social obligation, grounded in the cultic integration of the landless into the cultic community celebrating the pilgrimage festivals, which is no longer limited by genealogy.[180]

As part of the Dtn mosaic of 22:1-12*; 23:16-26*; 24:6–25:4* (within the larger unit of chs. 19–25), 23:16-26* associates social commandments (vv. 16-17,20[15-16,19],[21(20)],25-26[24-25]) with cultically thematized ordinances (vv. 18-19,22-24[17-18,21-23]). The series begins in vv. 16-17(15-16) with the commandment not to return an escaped slave, but to let him decide freely where he wants to live. The chain of expressions defining the place chosen in v. 17 *(beqirbeḵā bammāqôm ʾašer-yiḇḥar beʾaḥaḏ šeʿāreyḵā)* moves from the general to the specific. The sequence leads up to *šeʿārîm* as a subdivision of the town *(māqôm).* With the nonspecific local sense of "city ward" as a starting point, *beʾaḥaḏ šeʿāreyḵā* defines precisely the status of the escaped slave. He is not enslaved once more. The slaves in 12:18; 16:11,14 are part of the family in contrast to the *šeʿārîm,* the clans. Instead, the escaped slave is identified with the landless, for whom the integration formula uses *šeʿārîm.*

The primary commandment of cultic centralization, in the dialectic of *hammāqôm* and *šeʿārîm* as the hermeneutical key to the Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26*, also lies behind the judicial system in 16:18–18:8*. In accordance with established procedures, including the "model trial with its built-in requirement of two witnesses,"[181] in 17:2-13*, those cases that can be decided conclusively within the scope of the two-witnesses requirement, including cultic transgressions, are assigned to the local court (vv. 2abα, 3aα,4,5a*,6-7). The ambiguous cases that were assigned to cultic courts at the local sanctuaries with the centralization of the cult are set aside (*plʾ* [niphal] *bišeʿāreyḵā*) and transferred to the central court.[182] With *ʿlh ʾel māqôm* (+ centralization formula), the terminology of the cultic centralization command is applied to the judicial system.[183]

Concise redactional activity is evidenced by 17:2,7, which recalls 13:2,6(1,5) with *beqirbeḵā* and the *biʿartā* formula and expands *beqirbeḵā* by adding *beʾaḥaḏ šeʿāreyḵā.* Going beyond ch. 13, the judicial system laid down in 17:2-13* regulates procedures against the background of cultic centralization. The phrase *beʾaḥaḏ šeʿāreyḵā* clearly assigns the case under discussion to the competent local court. The expression *beqirbeḵā*

178. C. Bultmann, *Der Fremde im antiken Juda. FRLANT* 153 (1992), 74-84.

179. See II.1 above.

180. E. Otto, *Theologische Ethik des AT. TW* 3/2 (1994).

181. N. Lohfink, "Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes, . . ." in *Testimonium Veritati. FS W. Kempf* (Frankfurt am Main, 1971), 144 = *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I. SBAB* 8 (1990), 306.

182. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School,* 233-36.

183. Levinson, 404-9.

alone is too imprecise for a procedure meant to distinguish between local and central courts. In 13:7-12(6-11)* the connotations of *šaʿar,* which are not simply local but also genealogical, include the case of apostasy with a family.

Finally, the Dtn use of *šᵉʿāreyḵā* in contrast to *hammāqôm* is linked with the use of *šaʿar* for the place of judgment and execution, antedating the Dtn redaction, which is retained in 17:5. This text is not an example of inner-biblical exegesis reflecting different strata.[184] As in the relationship of Gen. 9:1-7a to Gen. 1:26-29,[185] we are dealing with an interpretive continuation in a single literary stratum and redactional conception.

The judicial procedure in Dt. 17:2-13* is preceded by regulations governing the personnel of local courts in 16:18-19. In ordering the installation of *šōpᵉṭîm* and *šōṭᵉrîm* in these courts, this passage borrows the phrase *bᵉḵol šᵉʿāreyḵā* from 12:15 and associates it with the Dtn short form (long forms and Dtr) of the land-gift formula *(ʾᵃšer yhwh ʾᵉlōheyḵā nōṯēn lᵉḵā),* elsewhere associated with *šᵉʿāreyḵā* only in 16:5,18. In this manner, the laws governing festivals and the laws governing the judicial system are joined together.

The regulations governing the personnel for local courts in 16:18-19* deal both with their appointment and their conduct in office. In 16:19 there is a link with Ex. 23:6,8, the forensic regulations of the Covenant Code.[186] The phrase *bᵉḵol-šᵉʿāreyḵā* at the beginning of 16:18-19 makes definitively clear that the regulations govern the local courts. In 18:6, the key verse for the personnel of the central court, the words *hammāqôm ʾᵃšer yiḇḥar yhwh* set these regulations apart from those governing the local courts. The Dtn centralization terminology *hammāqôm — šᵉʿārîm* is used in both the procedural regulations in 17:2-8* and the personnel regulations in 16:18-19; 18:1-8*. Here, as in the Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26* as a whole, the focus is on providing for the Levites.

All the semantic connotations of the lexeme *šaʿar* in the Dtn redaction derive from the basic meaning "city gate," which is also its meaning in the pre-Dtn occurrences in Dt. 12–26*. Therefore the prominent use of this lexeme as a contrast to *hammāqôm* in the late preexilic redaction of Deuteronomy presupposes an urbanized Judea, even when *šaʿar,* like *bābtu(m),* has the connotation of a genealogically integrated association. The historical context of the Dtn redaction is the forced urbanization of Judea during the Assyrian crisis of the 8th and 7th centuries. This urbanization went hand in hand with a weakening of traditional familial and genealogical relationships within the extended family.[187] The Dtn redaction of Dt. 12–26* does not give up the genealogical ties binding the nuclear and extended family as the foundation of society. These are the social entities into which the landless are to be integrated. Slaves are assigned to nuclear families, the landless — Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans — to clans. The power of the gentilic associations to integrate society was weakened by the upheavals

184. As argued by Levinson, 407.

185. M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1985), 318-21.

186. E. Otto, in Braulik et al., eds., *FS N. Lohfink,* 272-73.

187. B. Halpern, "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century BCE," in Halpern and D. W. Hobson, eds., *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel. JSOTSup* 124 (1991), 41-77.

of the Assyrian period. The Dtr reform steps into the breach, establishing a support system for the Levites through the institution of the regular tithe and for the landless through the triennial tithe. The latter (26:12-13) constitutes the end and goal of the Dtn reform program. As one of the pillars of the Dtn redaction, the integration formula *ʾašer bišᵉʿāreyḵā* aims at integrating the landless into the genealogically integrated associations of the clans.

But the ability of the gentilic associations to integrate strangers is not the sole benefit of the integration formula. The other is the constitution of Israel through the cultic celebration of the pilgrimage festivals at the central sanctuary, shared in by all, including the landless (16:11,14). The program of cultic integration of Judahite society permits its ethos to transcend the boundaries of genealogy. The Dtn reform program is a response to the social upheavals caused by the Assyrian crisis and the consequent uprooting of many individuals.

c. *Dtr Redaction.* The language of the Dtr redactor of the Decalog (DtrN) makes use of the integration formula of the Dtn redactor.[188] The Dtr redactor, however, reinforces the genealogical connotation of *šᵉʿāreyḵā*. In the Dtn redaction *gēr* does not have a suffix when used with the integration formula; the stranger is thus distinct from the members of narrower family. In the Sabbath commandment of the Decalog (Dt. 5:14), however, the *gērᵉḵā ʾašer bišᵉʿāreyḵā* appears in the series listing members of a nuclear family living under one roof, including domestic animals; and 31:12 lists *gērᵉḵā ʾašer bišᵉʿāreyḵā* in a series that includes men, women, and children.

Going beyond the legal functions of the Levites, the Dtr redactors equate them with the priests in 17:18; 24:8; 27:9, but have no particular interest in improving their support beyond what is provided in the Dtn redaction. In 12:12 the integration formula with *hallēwî* is simply included as a quotation from Dtn usage. This is the only Dtr use of the integration formula in Dt. 12–16; it is explained by the fact that 12:12 expands the six Dtn occurrences in 12:18; 14:21,27,29; 16:11,14 to seven.[189] In 6:9 and 11:20 *šaʿar* in the sense of "city gate" is one of the places (along with the doorposts of houses[190]) where the words of Yahweh's *tôrâ* are to be written.[191] The Dtr curse traditions (28:52,55,57) use the plural of *šaʿar* in the general sense of "city gate" or "city."

---

188. E. Otto, "Von der Programmschrift einer Rechtsreform zum Verfassungsentwurf des Neuen Israel," in G. Braulik, ed., *Studien zum Deuteronomium. Herders Biblische Studien* 4 (1994), 93-104.

189. G. Braulik, "Die Funktion von Siebenergruppierungen im Endtext des Deuteronomiums," in F. Reiterer, ed., *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 37-50; N. Lohfink, *BN* 51 (1990) 33-36.

190. Cf. representations of parents and children praying at Egyptian doorposts; Brunner, *LexÄg,* VI, 780-81.

191. Keel, 167-92; cf. the placing of a *kidinnu* ("protective symbol") on the city gate; see also W. F. Leemans, *FS J. C. van Oven* (Leiden, 1946), 36-61; J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis* (Munich, 1992), 218-19; Braulik, "Deuteronomy and the Commemorative Culture of Israel," *Theology of Deuteronomy,* 185-88.

III. Iron Age Gates. Alongside the occurrences of *ša'ar* in literary contexts, archaeology yields importance evidence for the function of city gates in the context of architectural history.

Several Early Iron Age gates have been found: two-chamber gates at Beer-sheba (stratum VII)[192] and Megiddo (V.A),[193] and four-chamber gates at Ashdod (X).[194] The evidence is too scanty to support localization of the Early Iron four-chamber gate tradition in the coastal plain and the two-chamber tradition inland. The gates at Megiddo (under the influence of the coastal plain) and Beer-sheba can hardly be assigned to the same architectural tradition. Beer-sheba is associated with an Early Iron architectural tradition in the Negeb.[195] Gates of the monarchic period (Iron II) are characterized by a broad, usually straight path permitting an easy flow of traffic, a gate structure sited on the city side of the wall, and gate leaves invariably on the outward side, an arrangement that points to the civil function of the gate in the life of the city and contrasts with the fortified gates of the Middle Bronze period, which could also be shut on the city side (e.g., the east gate at Shechem[196]). There are six-chamber gates at Megiddo (IV.B), Hazor (X), Gezer (VI), Lachish (IV: city gate and palace gate), Ashdod (IX),[197] and Tel 'Ira (Tell Ǵarra).[198] There are four-chamber gates at Dan, Beer-sheba (V and III), Megiddo (IV.A), Gezer (main gate [IV] and outer gate),[199] Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh; "early gate"),[200] Timnah (Tell el-Batashi) (III),[201] Dor,[202] Beth-shan (V),[203] Jerusalem (north gate?),[204] and Ekron (Khirbet el-Muqanna') (III.B).[205] There are two-chamber gates at Mizpah ("late gate"),[206] Dor,[207] Kinnereth (Tell el-Oreme) (II),[208] Timnah (II),[209] Khirbet el-Qom,[210] Tell Beit Mirsim,[211] Ekron (III.A),[212] Khirbet Abu Mudawer, Khirbet

192. Herzog, *Beer-Sheba,* II, 25ff.; idem, *BASOR* 250:45.
193. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 94-95.
194. Ibid., 117.
195. Herzog, *BASOR* 250:45.
196. G. R. H. Wright, *ZA* 74:282-88.
197. Dothan and Porada, *'Atiqot* 15:19-28.
198. Y. Beit-Arieh, *Qad* 18 (1985) 19.
199. See below.
200. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 128-30.
201. Kelm and Mazar, *BASOR* 248:20-25; Kelm, *IEJ* 39:109; Ussishkin, *BASOR* 277/278:82-88: six-chamber gate.
202. Stern and Sharon, *IEJ* 37:205-7; Stern, *IEJ* 40:16-30; Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon, *IEJ* 42:43-44.
203. Rowe, 1-2, fig. 2; James, 40-43; Herzog, *Stadttor,* 108-9, fig. 87.
204. Avigad, 50, figs. 30 and 59.
205. T. Dothan and S. Gitin, *IEJ* 36 (1986) 106.
206. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 110-11.
207. Stern, *IEJ* 40:23, fig. 1.
208. Fritz, *Kinnereth,* 45.
209. Kelm and Mazar, *BASOR* 248:23; Kelm, *IEJ* 39:109.
210. J. S. Holladay, *RB* 78 (1971) 595.
211. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 118-19.
212. Dothan and Gitin, *IEJ* 36:106.

Whether Megiddo had a south gate of this nature must be considered uncertain, despite the similar treatment of the walls, since the area has not yet been excavated.

To increase security against a military attack, as early as Iron II.A the access roads to the gates at Megiddo, Dor, and Beer-sheba took a sharp bend. In the Iron II.B period, this arrangement appears at Dan, Mizpah ("early gate"), Timnah, and elsewhere.[240] We also find transverse walls blocking direct entry to the gate, as at Mizpah and Ashdod (IX). Outer gates were also added to the gates at Dan, Megiddo, Lachish, Beer-sheba, Gezer, and Timnah. At Ashdod and Megiddo six-chamber gates were replaced with four-chamber gates.

During the Iron II.C period (to 586 B.C.E.), the two-chamber gate was the dominant form. At Dor, Timnah, Ekron, Gezer (III), and Megiddo (III),[241] four-chamber gates were replaced with two-chamber gates. At Megiddo this change was undertaken when the city became an Assyrian provincial capital. In the case of some of the other towns where a two-chamber gate replaced a four-chamber gate with the transition from the 9th to the 8th century, we may also assume the influence of Assyrian policies, which sought to inhibit a strong fortification of Palestine.[242] A new two-chamber gate was built at Kinnereth. The six-chamber gate at Lachish (II), destroyed by the Assyrians,[243] was rebuilt as a simple gate with a gate house. Even in this period, the six- and four-chamber gate design did fall into total disuse. Beer-sheba (III/II), in the south of Judah, kept the plan of a four-chamber gate, and Tel ʿIra that of a six-chamber gate. At the fortress of Tell el-Kheleifeh, a new four-chamber gate was built.[244] The design of the 7th-century gate in the north wall of Jerusalem has not yet been determined.[245]

During the Persian period, the preexilic two-chamber gate of Dor was destroyed.[246] At Lachish (I) a gate was built after the plan of the preexilic "simple gate."[247] At Megiddo the buildings with two parallel rectangular rooms (603, 604) near the site of the preexilic gate may be interpreted as the Persian period entrance to the city, with barracks (rooms 634, 635),[248] or as an internal gate.[249] Kenyon[250] has proposed a Persian period date for the gate on the western ridge of the southwest hill of Jerusalem.[251]

IV. Pre-Hellenistic Jerusalem. The OT speaks of gates in the northern citadel of the Jerusalem settlement on the southeast hill. The location of these gates is known quite precisely. In the northwest corner of the northern defenses of Jerusalem, north of

240. See also Naumann, 299, figs. 404, 405 (Karatepe).
241. Lamon and Shipton, 71-83.
242. Reich and Brandl.
243. R. D. Barnett, *Assyrian Palace Reliefs in the British Museum* (London, ^{2}1976), pl. VI.
244. Herzog, *Stadttor*, 124-25.
245. Avigad, 50, figs. 30 and 59.
246. Stern, *IEJ* 40:24-25.
247. Herzog, *Stadttor*, 112-13.
248. Lamon and Shipton, 88-91, with fig. 117; Stern, *Culture*, 52.
249. Stern *IEJ* 40:27.
250. *Digging*, 194.
251. Crowfoot and Fitzgerald, 12-23; for further discussion see IV below.

the temple on the southeast hill, stood the Corner Gate *(šaʿar happinnâ)*. According to 2 K. 14:13 and 2 Ch. 25:23,[252] the Corner Gate was 400 cubits (about 600 ft.) from the Ephraim Gate (cf. Neh. 12:39), which was part of the western defenses of the southeast hill. According to Jer. 31:38, the Corner Gate was west of the towers of Hananel[253] and the Hundred (Neh. 3:1; 12:39), which constituted the northern citadel (*bîrâ*, Neh. 7:2). Expanded in the Hasmonean and Herodian periods, these towers were called the Antonia under Herod.[254] Zec. 14:10 describes Jerusalem as extending east to west "from the Gate of Benjamin to the place of the former gate *(šaʿar hāriʾšôn)*, to the Corner Gate *(šaʿar happinnâ)*" (the next words describe its extent north to south), suggesting the long tradition of the corner gate. According to 2 Ch. 26:9, King Uzziah built towers at the Corner Gate to fortify it. The expression *ʿal šaʿar* does not refer to battlements but to projecting towers like those associated with the Iron Age gate at Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh) and the postexilic Crowfoot Gate on the southeast hill of Jerusalem. The passage more likely refers to the Corner Gate at the time of the Chronicler than to the preexilic Corner Gate.[255]

Neh. 3:6 and 12:39 refer to the Corner Gate as the Jeshanah Gate *(šaʿar hayᵉšānâ)*. Williamson[256] explains this name as an ellipsis of *šaʿar hāʿîr hayᵉšānâ*, "Gate of the Old City." Another interpretation derives it from *šaʿar hāḥômâ hayᵉšānâ*.[257] The change of name from Corner Gate to Jeshanah Gate in the sense of "Gate of the Old City" is implausible in a period when nothing was left of the new city west of the Central Valley. The old and new cities of the preexilic period, furthermore, did not come together in the vicinity of the northern defenses but further south, at the place Neh. 3:8 calls the Broad Wall;[258] the entrance to the lower city therefore cannot be identified with the Corner Gate. The same observations argue against the emendation *šaʿar hammišnēh*, "Gate of the New City."[259] Instead of deriving the name of the Jeshanah Gate from the adj. *yāšān*, "old,"[260] it is preferable to connect it with the border town Jeshanah (Khirbet al-Isaneh), about 15 miles north of Jerusalem (2 Ch. 13:19).[261]

The Corner Gate was the western gate of the northern defenses of Jerusalem; opposite it on the southeastern hill was an eastern gate called the Benjamin Gate (*šaʿar binyāmîn*, Jer. 37:13; 38:7). In Neh. 3:1,32; 12:39, the Benjamin Gate is called the Sheep Gate *(šaʿar haṣṣōʾn)*, situated east of the Tower of the Hundred and the Tower of Hananel. The name of this gate survives in John 5:2, which locates the pool of

252. Cf. *BHS* and 2 Ch. 26:9.

253. See V.1 below.

254. Josephus *Ant.* 15.11.4 §409; 18.4.3 §92.

255. P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 63-66.

256. P. 83.

257. Simons, 276.

258. Avigad, 62.

259. Simons, 306; Vincent and Steve, 240.

260. Gunneweg, *Nehemia,* 68.

261. Josephus *Ant.* 14.15.12 §458.

Valley Gate was located on the southeast hill[271] or the southwest hill,[272] and whether it was to be identified with the gate excavated by Bliss and Dickie[273] in what is today the Protestant Cemetery on the slope of the southwest hill above the Hinnom Valley, the so-called Essene Gate.[274] More recent excavations on the southwest hill have overtaken this debate. There is no evidence for any settlement on the southwest slope of the southeast hill in pre-Hasmonean times.[275] Identification of the Valley Gate with the gate excavated by Crowfoot and Fitzgerald[276] on the northern crest of the southeast hill[277] is burdened by the unclear stratigraphy, which precludes any definite statement about pre-Hasmonean use of the gate.[278] The name of this gate comes from a road leading from it into the Central Valley between the southeast and southwest hills.

A series of landmarks in Neh. 2:13-14 runs from north to south, beginning as follows: Valley Gate, Dragon's Spring (En-rogel [modern Bir Ayyub], south of the junction of the Central and Kidron valleys), Dung Gate. Neh. 3:13[279] gives the distance from the Valley Gate to the Dung Gate (*ša'ar hāšᵃpôṯ*[280]) as 1,000 cubits. It is impossible to tell whether the text is using the small cubit (18 in.) or the larger royal Egyptian cubit (22 in.) (cf. Ezk. 40:5; 43:13; 2 Ch. 3:3);[281] it is likewise impossible to determine the exact location of the Valley Gate as long as its identification with the Crowfoot Gate is in doubt. Therefore the location of the Dung Gate is also uncertain. The landmark list in Neh. 2:13-14 indicates that the Dung Gate is reached via the Dragon Gate because of the rubble in the southern Central Valley at the end of the spur extending from the southeast hill; this route suggests a location in the Kidron Valley, on the east side of the southern southeast hill.

The Dung Gate at the southern end of the southeast hill of Jerusalem is identical with the Potsherd Gate *(ša'ar haḥarsîṯ)*, which leads into the Hinnom Valley (Jer. 19:2). Wenning and Zenger tentatively identify it with the Valley Gate;[282] but the Hinnom Valley is separated from the Valley Gate by the southwest hill, and a road from the Valley Gate to the Hinnom Valley is implausible. The coexistence of the two names Potsherd Gate and Dung Gate suggests instead that these two gates are identical. This identification requires the assumption (not improbable) of an outer gate in the outer wall of King Hezekiah on the southern spur of the southeast hill, to enclose the reservoir at the end of Hezekiah's tunnel (2 Ch. 32:5).[283]

---

271. Procksch, 26-27, et al.
272. Dalman, 236; Fischer, *TQ* 113:275.
273. Pp. 16-19.
274. Pixner, Chen, and Margalit; Simons, 275, 279-81; Vincent and Steve, 244-45.
275. Tushingham, *Levant*, 19; idem, *Excavations*, 2, 16; Avigad, 61-63.
276. Pp. 12-23; cf. Oeming, 192-93.
277. Cf. Alt.
278. Otto, *Jerusalem*, 104-5, 123.
279. See *BHS;* A. van Selms, *ZAW* 91 (1979) 175.
280. *GesB*[18], 110; *HAL*, II, 1616; contra *HAL*, I, 97: "gate for the rubbish tips."
281. Ussishkin, *Levant* 8:88-89.
282. P. 288 n. 54.
283. Otto, *Jerusalem*, 71-72 and 65 n. 7.

The Fountain Gate *(šaʿar hāʿayin)* is located by Neh. 2:14 south of the "King's Pool," by 3:14-15 (cf. 12:37) south of the "wall of the pool of the conduit *(šelaḥ)*[284] by the King's Garden" and the "stairs that go down from the City of David." These features have been verified by the excavations of Weill at the southern southeast end of the southeast hill.[285] This provides a fixed point for locating the Fountain Gate.[286] The King's Garden (2 K. 25:4)[287] was located south of the southwest hill, in the Kidron Valley. The King's Pool mentioned in Neh. 2:14 was associated with the King's Garden in the Kidron Valley.[288] A derivation of the name "Fountain Gate" from the "Fountain of Siloam" *(ʿên silwān)* is discussed in the literature;[289] but two arguments speak against it: first the distance, and second the fact that this name first appears in the Roman period *(Silōán Pēgḗ)*,[290] when the function of Hezekiah's tunnel had been forgotten.[291] More likely, the name comes from the Rogel Fountain or an artificial water supply from the King's Pool.[292]

A "gate between the two walls" *(šaʿar bên haḥōmōṯayim)* leading to the King's Garden is mentioned in 2 K. 25:4; Jer. 39:4; 52:7. Of the possible identifications of this gate, we may eliminate the outer gate in Hezekiah's outer wall, since this wall was not rebuilt after the exile. Identification with either the Dung Gate[293] or the Fountain Gate[294] is possible. If the gate between the walls is identified with the Dung Gate (or Potsherd Gate), we must think in terms of an outer gate — as at Gezer,[295] Megiddo, and Dan — although the texts of Kings and Jeremiah do not reflect such a gate. In this interpretation *haḥōmōṯayim* refers to the main wall and the outer wall. The prep. *bên* is awkward, since the gate is in the main wall, not between the walls. These considerations make identification with the Fountain Gate more likely. Both gates were associated with the King's Garden. The name of the gate between the two walls would then derive from its construction as a "gate between the walls."[296] Even the most recent excavations in the area in question at the southern end of the southeast hill do not enable us to reach a decision on the basis of archaeological evidence.[297]

North of the Fountain Gate, on the east side of the fortifications of the southeast

---

284. Gunneweg, *Nehemia*, 70; contra Shanks, 74: *šilōaḥ*.

285. *Cité*, I, 60-68; II, 36-38, 40-47, 92-96, pls. XXVa, XXVI.

286. On the royal graves mentioned in Neh. 3:16, see Weill, *Cité*, II, pl. II; Otto, *Jerusalem*, 79, 81.

287. See also Josephus *B.J.* 5.145.

288. On its location see Wenning and Zenger, 293 (pool 49).

289. Burrows, *AASOR* 14:129; idem, *JBL* 54:35.

290. Josephus *B.J.* 5.145.

291. Otto, *Jerusalem*, 124-25.

292. Weill, *Cité*, II, 94; Simons, 121-22 n. 2.

293. Avi-Yonah, 245.

294. Paton; Wenning and Zenger, 285.

295. Dever, *BASOR* 289:34, fig. 1.

296. See III above.

297. Shiloh, *Excavations*, 4-6; for a reconstruction of the course of the wall, see wall G in Weill, *Cité*, II, 27ff., pls. 1 and 2.

hill and about at the level of the Gihon, stood the Water Gate *(ša'ar hammayim).* It is mentioned only in postexilic texts (Neh. 3:26; 8:1,3,16; 12:37); but the rebuilding account in Neh. 3:26 shows that we are dealing with a gate that belonged only to the preexilic fortifications, since the Water Gate is described explicitly as being located outside *(neged)* the walls. It may be identified with the access to the Gihon in preexilic fortifications (1 K. 1:33,38,45).[298] All excavations on the southeast hill have confirmed that the wall of the postexilic fortifications ran further west than the preexilic wall, which was lower in the Kidron Valley.[299] There is still no final verification of this gate. Franken, who is responsible for publishing Kenyon's excavations on the southeast hill, notes an unpublished 7th-century gate unearthed during Kenyon's excavations in trench I above the Gihon, only recognized as such in conjunction with the excavations near Shiloh.[300] On the other hand, there is likely no connection between the Valley Gate and an entranceway unearthed by Parker immediately adjacent to the Gihon and interpreted as a gate, since the site lies off the course of the pre- and postexilic fortifications on the east side of the southeast hill.[301] Furthermore, the remains are most likely not those of a gate but of an Iron II house.[302]

If the Water Gate in Neh. 3:26 was not part of the preexilic wall but is to be identified with a gate on the east side of the palace within the city,[303] then the rebuilding account in Neh. 3 omits the gate to the Gihon, which must have been part of the city fortifications on the southeast hill. This omission would also suggest that it was not part of the wall in the Persian period. In the context of the rebuilding account, "on the east" *(lammizrāḥ)* is not part of the gate's name but refers to the situation of the gate relative to the wall. According to Neh. 8:1, the people assembled in the square before the Water Gate.[304] An association with the Gihon ('En Sitti Maryam) is the best explanation for the name of the gate.

The Mifqad Gate *(ša'ar hammipqād,* "Gate of the Guard, Muster Gate,"[305] or "Prison Gate"[306]) mentioned in Neh. 3:31 is the inner gate of a structure on the southeast hill, which may have been connected with the temple precincts. Since the Mifkad Gate is not mentioned in Neh. 12:31-39, Gunneweg tentatively identifies it with the Gate of the Guard or Prison Gate *(ša'ar hammaṭṭārâ),* likewise located at the northeast corner of the city fortifications.[307]

---

298. Dalman, 169.

299. C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine 1873-1874,* I (1899), 296; Weill, *Cité,* I, 125-26; Macalister and Duncan, *Plan,* 48-49; Kenyon, *Digging,* 182-87; Shiloh, *Excavations,* 29-30; see also Simons, 79-80; Otto, *Jerusalem,* 103.

300. H. J. Franken, *Levant* 19 (1987) 129-35.

301. Vincent, *Jérusalem,* pl. VI.

302. Reich.

303. Avi-Yonah, 247; W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia. HAT* I/20 (1949), 119.

304. Gunneweg, *Nehemia,* 72, with n. 13.

305. *HAL,* II, 1617.

306. Gunneweg, *Nehemia,* 73.

307. P. 73.

The gates of the Hellenistic and Roman fortifications of Jerusalem are discussed elsewhere.[308]

V. Functions.

1. *Defense.* The gate was the most vulnerable point in a city's defenses; its defensive functions therefore took precedence over its symbolic-proleptic functions and its role in defining the city's identity. Enemy attacks concentrated on the gate (2 S. 10:8; 11:23; Isa. 28:6; Ezk. 21:20[15])[309] with the aim of breaking down its leaves by means of battering rams (Ezk. 21:27[22]), occupying it, and thus invading the city (Ezk. 26:10; Ob. 11,13; Mic. 2:13). Location, architecture, and construction techniques attempted to meet the threat of the ram as new military technologies emerged.

When the city occupied an elevated site, the rams had to be brought up to the gates and walls on siege ramps (2 S. 20:15; Ezk. 4:2). Such a ramp used in the Assyrian attack under Sennacherib has been unearthed at Lachish.[310] A relief in the Neo-Assyrian palace at Nineveh (Kuyunjik) pictures five siege ramps grouped around the gate in the southwest defenses of Lachish, with battering rams directed against the city.[311] Numerous Iron Age gates in Israel exhibit traces of fire (e.g., the gate at Dan[312]). As a defense against being burned, the leaves could be covered with bronze plates (Isa. 45:2; Ps. 107:16; 1 Ch. 22:3). Having captured a city, the enemy would destroy its gates by dismantling and burning them (Jer. 51:58; Nah. 3:13; Lam. 1:4; 2:9; Neh. 2:17). At Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh), traces of fire in the blocked main gate indicate that it was burned after the city had been taken. Finally, the defenders could also use the gate to mount a sortie against the attackers (Josh. 8:5; 2 S. 11:23).

The primary aim in planning the layout of a gate was to make it difficult to approach and impossible to break through. These poliorcetic considerations had to reach a compromise with the civil functions of the gate in times of peace, primarily the provision of easy access to the city even by large vehicles. The narrow Early Bronze gates[313] used in Palestine (e.g., Tel Arad and et-Tell) in the 3d millennium were not suited to this civil function and fell into disuse at the end of the Early Bronze Age in the late 3d millennium. In the Middle Bronze Age four- and six-chamber gates appeared, some with heavily fortified towers, as at Hazor, Megiddo, Shechem (northwest gate), Beth-shemesh, Yavneh-yam, and Tell el-Farah (South).[314] These gates were "cut off"[315] from the wall and were turned into fortresses by strong doors facing both outward and into the city. Because weapons and food could be stored in the side and upper cham-

---

308. Otto, *Jerusalem,* 122-26, 153-55; R. Wenning, *Boreas* 14/15 (1991/92), 14-15, with bibliog.

309. Yadin, *Warfare,* I, 21-23; II, 323-28.

310. Ussishkin, *TAJ* 5 (1978) 67-74; idem, *TAJ* 10:137-42.

311. Barnett, *Assyrian Palace Reliefs,* 26-28, pl. VI; I. Eph'al, *TAJ* 11 (1984) 60-70.

312. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 91.

313. Weippert, 166-67.

314. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 44-73; Gregori; for Mesopotamia see Opificius, 86-87; Damerji, 263-85.

315. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 158.

Magical protection was also sought. The gate was the place of transition from the protected space of a walled city to the unprotected countryside outside the city (cf. the Akkadian antonyms *ālu[m]*/*ṣēru[m]* and Heb. *ʿîr/śāḏeh;* also the etymological association of the noun *ʿîr* with a vb. *ʿîr,* "protect"[323]). Therefore the gates, and hence the entire city, needed magical protection. In 2 K. 23:8b we read of a "gate of Joshua the governor of the city" *(šaʿar yᵉhôšuaʿ śar-hāʿîr)*[324] to the left as someone entered the city gate *(šaʿar hāʿîr)* (LXX^L^); the pedestals with "satyrs" (*bāmôṯ haśśᵉʿirîm* [LXX^L^])[325] alongside this gate were broken down *(ntṣ).* We can agree in part with Gray's discussion of this text:[326] originally, the satyrs played a positive role as guardian spirits. An etymological connection of *haśśᵉʿirîm* with Akk. *šēdu* (cf. Heb. *šēḏ*[327]) as proposed by Spieckermann[328] is impossible, but their function was clearly analogous to that of the Mesopotamian and Syrian gate guardians *šēdu/aladlammû* and *lamassu.*[329] The latter terms also designated the orthostats set up beside the gates and doors of cities, temples, and palaces to protect them.[330]

Reliefs with a magical function carved into the doorjambs of gates are of Hittite origin and are widespread throughout Hatti-land as early as the time of the Hittite Empire (14th/13th century).[331] A good example is the gate of Hattusha (Boghazköy) with its lions and sphinxes. The late Hittite-Aramaic minor kingdoms in northern Syria and Mesopotamia cultivated this technique, in part under Hurrian and Mitannian influence; it flourished in the Neo-Assyrian period.[332] At Arslan Tash (Neo-Assyrian Ḫadatu), two lions from the east gate of the city and fragments of lions from the west gate have been unearthed;[333] these figures, dating from the time Shalmaneser III, served as gate guardians.[334]

Guardian spirits carved into doorjambs also protected the entrances of palaces. Describing the expansion of the palace in Nineveh, a building inscription of Esarhaddon declares: "To the left and right I set up *šēdu* and *lamassu* images made from various kinds of stone, whose appearance would turn back the breast of the enemy *(ir-ti lem-ni ú-tar-ru),* protect the footsteps of the king who made them, and guard his way *(na-ṣi-ru kib-si mu-šal-li-mu tal-lak-ti šarri ba-ni-šú-nu)* — I set them up to guard the bars of their doors."[335]

---

323. → XI, 54.
324. N. Avigad, *IEJ* 26 (1976) 181.
325. See *BHS;* J. Gray, *I and II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 730.
326. Cf. N. H. Snaith, *VT* 25 (1975) 115-18.
327. *HAL,* II, 1417.
328. H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 100.
329. W. von Soden, *FS E. Heinrich. BaghM* 3 (1964) 148-56.
330. See the citations in *CAD,* I/1, 286-87; X, 65; XVII/2, 259.
331. Naumann, 75-86.
332. Moortgat, *Kunst,* 99-100.
333. F. Thureau-Dangin et al., *BAH* 16 (1931) 70-75, 85-89, and pls. VI, XIV(2).
334. Albenda, 23c.
335. R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien. BAfO* 9 (1967), 62-63 (B V 41-47); for a pictorial representation see also A. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures — Palace of Sennacherib* (Hague, 1915), pls. XXVII, XXVIII; B. Hrouda, *Die Kulturgeschichte des assyrischen Flachbildes* (Bonn, 1965), pl. LVI (1-2).

II), and Lachish (III). Herzog estimates that a square could accommodate 800-1,000 persons.[350]

Besides being used together with the adjacent gate to collect rainwater (cf. Beer-sheba [V], Megiddo [IV.B]; 2 S. 23:15-16), a paved square could also provide a place for winnowing grain (Jer. 15:7), so that a gate square could be called a threshing floor (*gōren peṯaḥ haššaʿar,* 1 K. 22:10; 2 Ch. 18:9).[351] The Ugaritic Aqhat Epic[352] also presupposes this association of threshing floor and gate *(yṯb b ʾp ṯǵr tḥt ʾdrm dbgrn).* In unfortified villages the threshing floor also served as a place of assembly.[353] As the focus of public life, the gate was also an appropriate meeting place (Jgs. 16:2; 1 S. 9:18; 2 S. 3:27; 19:19; Isa. 28:6). It was also the place where sizable crowds would assemble to hear speeches and proclamations (Jer. 17:19-20; Prov. 1:21; 8:3).

Finally, citizens (Isa. 29:21; Jer. 17:19; Ps. 69:13[12]; Prov. 24:7; 2 Ch. 32:6) and elders (Prov. 31:23; Job 29:7-25; Lam. 5:14) assembled at the gate to discuss matters concerning the life of the city. Negotiations with strangers that might affect the public life of the city were conducted at the gate (Gen. 34:20). Internal administrative procedures such as apportionment of the tax burden to the various families could also be looked after in the gate (Am. 5:10-11).[354]

At Beer-sheba (II) a warehouse unearthed near the gate[355] probably provided storage for contributions of produce rather than serving as a barracks for soldiers.[356] Starting toward the end of the 8th century, the governmental organization in Judah became increasingly refined. Dating from this period, there have been found at Tell Beit Mirsim,[357] Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh),[358] and Tirzah (Tell el-Farah [North])[359] sizable pillared buildings (cf. also the 10th-century buildings 1728 and 338 at Megiddo) associated with gate areas; these buildings may be interpreted as administrative centers. Already in the 10th and 9th centuries, palaces were associated with gates at Megiddo (palace 6000),[360] Gezer (palace 10000),[361] and Timna.[362] In Neo-Assyrian Megiddo (stratum III), palaces 1052, 1369, and 490 were built on the east and west sides of the gate.[363] This evidence casts light on the significance of the gate complex in cities that served as Neo-Assyrian administrative centers.[364]

---

350. *Stadttor,* 161.
351. Smith.
352. *KTU* 1.19, I, 22f.
353. Aranov, 167.
354. K. Koch, in H. W. Wolff, ed., *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 245.
355. Z. Herzog in Y. Aharoni, ed., *Beer-Sheba I* (Tel Aviv, 1973), 23-30.
356. As proposed by V. Fritz, *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 30-45.
357. M. and Y. Aharoni, *BASOR* 224 (1976) 73-76.
358. McCown, 211-12.
359. Chambon, pl. 20.
360. Yadin, *Hazor,* 154-56.
361. Ussishkin, *BASOR* 277/278:75-76.
362. Kelm and Mazar, *IEJ* 39:109-10.
363. Herzog, *Settlement and Fortification,* 253.
364. Y. Ikeda, *Iraq* 41 (1979) 75-87.

standard measures *(narû)*[374] could be posted at the gate. In one Old Babylonian document,[375] KÁ.GAL *(bābum/abullum)* should be translated "office."[376] Because gates were commercial centers, the term could be applied to other spaces fulfilling this function. The threshing floor, where grain was sold[377] and payments in kind were made,[378] was a natural alternative to the gate.[379]

Kings also made use of gates as centers of public life. Hezekiah assembled the people in the square at the city gate to inspire them with courage to face the attack of the Assyrians (2 Ch. 32:6). The kings of Israel and Judah, Ahab and Jehoshaphat, called on the prophets for advice at the threshing floor by the gate of Samaria (1 K. 22:10). Zedekiah was sitting at the Benjamin gate[380] when he received the news that Jeremiah had been arrested (Jer. 38:7-13). All the texts that speak of a king's presence in a gate presuppose a national emergency in Israel and Judah. The gate was the place where kings addressed the populace in such situations; in time of peace governmental business was transacted in the palace. In the courtyard between the main gate and the outer gate at Dan, excavation uncovered a rectangular structure made of hewn stones, approximately 7.5 ft. by 5 ft., which could be covered over by four wooden uprights. The excavator[381] tentatively interpreted this structure as a pedestal for a royal throne; it might also be interpreted as a cultic installation.[382]

Like the kings, their prophetic critics in Mari[383] and Judah (Jer. 17:19-20) used the public accessibility of the gate to address the populace. But prophets could also use the gates of palaces[384] and temples (Jer 7:2)[385] as places to proclaim their message.

Because the city gate functioned as the place of assembly for citizens and elders, it also took on the function of housing the local city court. The identification of the city court as the court at the gate is well established in legal traditions (Dt. 21:19; 22:15,24; 25:7; Josh. 20:4) and prophetic traditions (Isa. 29:21; Jer. 1:15; Am. 5:10,12,15), as well as in 2 S. 15:2; Ps. 127:5; Job 31:21; Prov. 22:22; Ruth 4:1,10,11. In an unfortified village, court was held at the threshing floor, which thus played the role of the gate in a fortified city.[386]

The local court as a governmental institution is not a Judahite or Israelite innovation; it goes back to Israel's Canaanite roots. In the Aqhat Epic,[387] Danel gives judgment in a

374. *CAD,* XI/1, 368.

375. *CT,* 6, 38a.

376. R. Westbrook, *Old Babylonian Marriage Laws. BAfO* 23 (1988), 118.

377. G. Dalman, *AuS,* III (1933), 74.

378. Laws of Eshnunna, §19: *ina maškānim ušaddan;* cf. Otto, *Rechtsgeschichte,* 37-42.

379. On *ina adri[m] iddunu* "deliver at the threshing floor," see P. Koschaker, *ASAW,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 39/5 (1928), 45 n. 1; *CAD,* I/1, 130.

380. See III above.

381. Biran, *IEJ* 22:165.

382. Herzog, *Stadttor,* 163.

383. *ARM* XXV/1, 206, 11, 14-15; 108, 13′, 15′; 221-bis, 10, 16, 23.

384. *ARM* XXVI/2, 371, 9, 15-16.

385. Cf. *ARM* XXVI/1, 402.

386. Matthews, 29-33.

387. *KTU* 1.17, V, 4-8; 1.19, I, 18-29.

gate court, not in his role as king but simply as one of the elders, all of equal rank.[388] The theory that there were no local courts in Israel before the monarchy[389] overlooks the Canaanite origins of such courts in Israel.[390] What is historically unique to the Israelite local courts is their temporary independence from supervision by royal courts.

In addition to the local courts and a court with national jurisdiction (2 S. 15:1-6; 2 K. 8:1-6; Jer. 26:1-19; Hos. 5:1[391]), there were cultic courts at the local sanctuaries to hear cases that could not be decided by the testimony of witnesses (Ex. 22:7-10[8-11]).[392]

In the period of the monarchy, the local courts had jurisdiction over cases governed by family law, over which the paterfamilias had originally exercised authority (Ex. 21:15-17; Dt. 21:15-17,18-21a; 22:13-21a,22a,23,24a,25,27-29; 24:1-4a,5; 25:5-10),[393] as well as cases involving bloodguilt, which had originally been governed by blood vengeance as the direct legal recourse of the injured family (Ex. 21:12-14,18-32; Dt. 19:2-13*; 21:1-9*). Not until the late preexilic period under Josiah were the local gate courts throughout Judah subjected to supervision by the state through integration into the judicial system of the central government and professionalized by the appointment of judges and scribes (Dt. 16:18-19*; 17:2-7), a process attested for Jerusalem already in the 8th century (Isa. 1:26; 3:2; cf. Zeph. 3:3).[394]

When the cult was centralized, the cultic courts at the local sanctuaries were replaced by a central court in Jerusalem, which had jurisdiction over all cases that could not be decided by the testimony of two witnesses.[395] The procedural regulations in Ex. 23:1-3,6-8* serve to guarantee a fair trial by demanding truthful testimony and forbidding preferential treatment of any social stratum, either the powerful or the weak. In the Dtn legal reform, eyewitness testimony was subjected to the requirement of two witnesses (Dt. 17:6; 19:15).

The pre-Dtn corpus of family law in Deuteronomy provides an instructive picture of how a trial was conducted in the local gate court during the period before Josiah's legal reform. The local elders presided over the hearing (Dt. 21:19-20; 22:15-19; 25:7-9); the plaintiff appeared before them, and the defendant was brought before them. A capital sentence imposed by the verdict of the elders was carried out by the men of the town (21:21; 22:21). The execution could take place at the gate where the trial was held (17:5; 22:24; cf. 21:21; 1 K. 21:13; Lev. 24:14; Nu. 15:35-36) or at the site of the crime (Dt. 22:21).

The laws of the Covenant Code and the pre-Dtn material in Deuteronomy allow us

388. B. Margalit, *Ugaritic Poem of AQHT. BZAW* 182 (1989), 361-62.

389. Crüsemann, 70-73.

390. E. Otto, *RHJ* 7 (1988) 347-68.

391. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 74.

392. T. Frymer-Kensky, "The Judicial Ordeal in the Ancient Near East" (diss., Yale, 1977), 474ff.; E. Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründigungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. StBib* 3 (1988), 14-19.

393. See II.2 above.

394. Gertz, 74-82; also Niehr, 87-91.

395. Otto, "Deuteronomistische Gestaltung," *FS O. Kaiser,* 142-55.

to reconstruct the scope of the local court's jurisdiction. One important task of the local court was to regulate conflict between local families in cases involving bodily injury (Ex. 21:18-32),[396] loss of or damage to property held on deposit, the responsibilities of animal tenders, rental of fields (Ex. 22:6-14[7-15]), and damage to fields (Ex. 22:4-5[5-6]). The vast majority of the individual ordinances and short collections in these codes go back to the local courts held in the gate. Complex collections were edited with the aid of scribal expertise, which drew on material originating in the practice of these courts.[397]

The collections in the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy that deal with family law and bloodguilt show that local courts also acquired jurisdiction over transgressions of private family law and offenses involving bloodguilt; thus passing sentence on capital crimes also became the job of the local courts. Only in Ex. 22:13-14(14-15) and the pre-Dtn collections in Deuteronomy — i.e., in the traditions that substituted judicial proceedings in local courts for private punishment — is the court procedure itself thematized in the laws (cf. Dt. 19:1-13*; 21:18-21*; 22:13-21*,22-28*; 25:5-10). The replacement of private criminal law required reflection on the procedures followed in the local gate courts; cases of damage and personal injury, however, which had always been adjudicated by the local courts, required only reflection on the legal consequences of different cases. The inclusion of family law and blood guilt collections in the Josianic Deuteronomy, which retained the jurisdiction of the gate courts over these cases, shows that this jurisdiction was meant to continue when the local gate courts came under state supervision.

Deuteronomy interprets the Covenant Code within the framework of cultic centralization and supplements it in those sections that are unrelated to cultic centralization — the laws dealing with damage to property and bodily injury — by adding family law. We may conclude from this observation that these areas of the law also remained associated with the local gate courts. In other words, the Dtn legal reform did not alter the jurisdiction of the local gate courts. The central court had jurisdiction only when cases in these areas — except for family law, for which the elders continued to be responsible — could not be decided by the local courts within the framework of the requirement of two witnesses.

In the postexilic period the *ʿēḏâ*, which likewise sat at the gate (Sir. 7:7), replaced the court of the elders (cf. Josh. 20:4).[398] In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the public civil functions of the gate were transferred to the agora and the synagogues.[399] In the Persian period the synagogue took over the religious function of the gate square as a place for prayer and the reading of the Torah (Neh. 8:1).[400]

The gates of the temple courts, especially the inner court, were places of prayer,

396. E. Otto, *Körperverletzungen in den Keilschriftrechten und im AT. AOAT* 226 (1991), 118-64.

397. Otto, *JSOT* 57 (1993) 3-22.

398. Niehr, 106-9.

399. S. B. Hoenig, "The Ancient City-Square," *ANRW*, II.19.1 (1979), 448-76.

400. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11. AB* (1991), 78-81.

where the worshiper requested admittance (Ps. 118:19-20). In Egyptian temples inscriptions were displayed at the side entrances through which the minor priests entered the temple each morning and at the main entrance through which the high priest, representing the king, entered the temple. These inscriptions combined general ethical precepts with precepts embodying priestly and administrative professional ethics.[401] In these inscriptions the oath taken by priests at their initiation was repeated. The Egyptian genre of purgative priestly confession exhibits not only formal but also substantial parallels to the gate liturgies in Ps. 15 and 24.[402] In these psalms an oath of purgation is imposed not on the priest but on each individual worshiper wishing to enter the temple court. If Egyptian influence goes beyond this similarity, it would be unusual for it to be manifested in a cultic procession with the ark,[403] since the Egyptian perspective is not that of the deity's entering the sanctuary but rather that of the deity's gracious favor toward the world emerging.

The legal and ethical norms in Ps. 15 and 24 (gate psalms) are firmly grounded in the theology of the Jerusalem temple priesthood.[404] The integration of law into priestly theology and the consequent theologization of law and the development of a theological ethos (e.g., Ex. 23:4-5) that is rooted in law and supports it[405] is an expression of the solarization of Jerusalem priestly theology by the inclusion of *šamaš* motifs;[406] these same motifs appear in the legal foundations of the Covenant Code (Ex. 22:20-26*[21-27*]).[407] The legal traditions of the local gate courts were preserved by the learned scribal redactors of the legal collections and adopted by priests in Jerusalem. There they were interpreted theologically in the context of a solarized royal theology of Yahweh (Ex. 20:24-26*; 22:20-26*[21-27*]). The laws protecting the poor (Ex. 22:20-26*[21-27*]; Ps. 15:5) and providing for fair judicial procedures (Ex. 23:1-3,6-8; Ps. 24:4b; Ex. 20:16; Dt. 5:20)[408] provided the main gateway for the theologization of law under the influence of a solarized Yahwism, especially under Assyrian influence.

Toward the end of the Assyrian period, segments of the Jerusalem priesthood deserted this way of grounding the law, turning instead to a cultic law of prerogatives, in which the theology of the land played a central role. This law emphasized the setting apart of firstfruits and firstborn, the Sabbath and the Sabbatical Year (Ex. 22:28-29; 23:10-12). In Ex. 22:18(19)–23:12 they placed the section governing judicial procedure (23:1-3,6-8), already theologized (v. 7b), in the context of this new legal principle. This form of theologically based law was set in the framework of prerogative laws (Ex.

---

401. Grieshammer.

402. J. Assmann, *Ma'at* (1990), 145.

403. See also B. Janowski, *ZTK* 86 (1989) 428-33.

404. E. Otto, *ZAW* 98.

405. Otto, *Vom Rechtsbruch zur Sünde.*

406. On the ancient Near Eastern background of sun-god theology, see B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils. WMANT* 59 (1989), 174-91; O. Keel, "Fern von Jerusalem," in F. Hahn et al., eds., *Zion, Ort der Begegnung. FS L. Klein. BBB* 90 (1993), 484-99, strongly emphasizing Jebusite influence on the Jerusalem sun-god motifs in the OT.

407. E. Otto, *ZTK* 88 (1991) 165-68.

408. T. Veijola, *ZAW* 103 (1991) 1-17.

served as a meeting room for the cabinet, an audience chamber, and a court. The proclamations uttered there by the king had the force of law throughout the land. High dignitaries of Egyptian society — though hardly professionally trained — functioned as judges, vicariously representing the king. They had the right to preside over trials (*wḏʿ-ʿryt,* "open the portico").[425] The temple gate where justice was administered could be referred to as "the gate where justice is dispensed" *(rwt-dỉ-mȝʿt).*[426] Such gates have been identified at Edfu, Esna, Karnak, Medamud, Dendera, Akhmim, and Tanis. At Edfu a gate court of the birth house (Mammisi) opposite the main temple is also described as "the place where the requests of every petitioner are received, that justice may be distinguished from injustice [*r wp mȝʿt r ỉsft*], the great place where the weak are upheld to protect them from the strong" and "the noble portal of the 'gate where justice is pronounced' *(sbȝ šps nt rwt-dỉ-mȝʿt)* opposite [the temple of] Edfu."[427]

VI. 1. *LXX.* For the most part the LXX translates *šaʿar* with the lexeme *pýlē* (ca. 287 times), which also serves to translate *deleṯ* (10 times), *sap* (bis), and *peṯaḥ* (6 times). In the LXX *pýlē* translating *šaʿar* can refer to a city gate (Gen. 19:1; 34:20,24; etc.), the gate to the temple court or temple (Ps. 23:7,9; 117:19-20 LXX; etc.), the palace gate (Jer. 22:2,4), the gate of heaven (Gen. 28:17), and the gate of the netherworld (Wis. 16:13; cf. Pss. Sol. 16:2). The semantic spectrum of *šaʿar* differentiates several aspects; the LXX incorporates this differentiation by using variant translations. When Deuteronomy uses *šaʿar* in contrast to *māqôm,* leading to the formula of integrating the landless *(ʾᵃšer bišᵉʿāreyḵā),*[428] *šaʿar* stands by synecdoche for the city itself. Here the LXX translates *šaʿar* with *pólis* (Dt. 12:15,17,18,21; 14:21,27; etc.). The Sabbath commandment of the Decalog (Dt. 5:14; Ex. 20:10 LXX) diverges from the usage, translating the integration formula with *ho paroikṓn en soí.* For the LXX, too, the Decalog is to be in force under all circumstances; in contrast to Dt. 12–26, it is not bound to an urban civilization in a developed region.

When *šaʿar* denotes the gate as a court or place of execution, or a place to affix the word of God (Dt. 6:9; 11:20; 21:19; 22:15,24; 25:7), the LXX translates it with *pýlē.* In the Greek and Hellenistic period, the use of the gate as a court of law was well known.[429] In Dt. 16:18-19 the LXX translation reflects the Ptolemaic legal institution of the college of chrematists, as is shown clearly by the translation of *šōṭēr* as *grammatoeisagōgeús.*[430]

In Est. 4:2,6 LXX translates *šaʿar hammeleḵ* with *pýlē toú basiléōs,* since here the reference is to the palace gate. When *šaʿar hammeleḵ* denotes the entrance to the administrative area of the palace (2:19; 5:9) as the royal administrative center (3:2-3;

425. See van den Boorn.
426. See Sauneron.
427. Brunner, *Symbolon* 6:45.
428. See II.3.b above.
429. For citations see Stricker, 325 n. 2068.
430. Rüterswörden, *Gemeinschaft,* 13-14.

5:13; 6:10), the LXX translates it with *aulḗ*. In Dnl. 2:49 *biṯᵉraʿ malkāʾ* is translated with *basilikḗ aulḗ*.

In Job 5:4; Prov. 14:19; Ezk. 46:12, the LXX translates *šaʿar* with *thýra*, a lexeme that usually represents *peṯaḥ* and occasionally *deleṯ*. If *šaʿar* in Job 5:4 and Prov. 14:19 stands for the city or palace gate, the use of *thýra* by the LXX in these verses points to the dwelling place, thus underlining the effect on the family of the relationship between actions and consequences. In Ezk. 46:12 the use of *thýra* in the sense of *deleṯ* is an interpretive translation of *šaʿar*.

In Jgs. 18:16-17; 1 Ch. 26:13; Ezk. 40:9, *šaʿar* is translated with *pylṓn*, a lexeme that also represents *sap* and *peṯaḥ*. Jgs. 18:16-17 is the only place in the OT where *šaʿar* denotes the entrance to a group of houses belonging to a clan, but here the LXX follows standard OT usage, which uses *peṯaḥ* for the entrance to a single residence. In 1 Ch. 26:13 LXX a portico *(pylṓn)* stands at each of the cardinal points of the temple courtyard (cf. Mt. 26:71); these structures are distinct from the secondary gates (*pýlē*, 1 Ch. 26:16). In Ezk. 40:9 *ailam* (= *ʾulām*) *toú pylṓnos* is distinct from *ailam (= sap) tḗs pýlēs*.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Temple Scroll uses *šaʿar* primarily to denote the gates of the temple courts. The inner court, which only the priests may enter, has four gates, one on each side in the middle of the wall surrounding the court (11QT 36:[1]-11). Each gate measures 40 cubits on a side. The gate chamber is divided into four side rooms on either side of the passageway.[431] The plan of the temple in the book of Ezekiel provides for only three gates in Ezk. 40:28-46; the west side of the inner court serves as fore-court to the temple. In the Temple Scroll the middle court of the temple is open to cultically qualified males. In Ezk. 46:1-3 the prince may enter only as far as the inner threshold of the inner court; the people may come only to the entrance to the gate. The Temple Scroll continues this hierarchy of holiness, adding to it a middle court open only to cultically qualified males. This middle court has three gates in each of its four sides, named for the twelve tribes of Israel (11QT 39:11-13). The base of each gate is 28 cubits square. The outer court (40:5–45:6), which women may also enter, likewise has three gates in each of its four sides, each with a base 50 cubits square. Like the gates of the middle court, the gates of the outer court are named for the twelve tribes of Israel (40:14–41:12).[432]

11QT 51:11-18 is based on Dt. 16:18-19, supplemented by Dt. 1:16-17 and Ex. 23:6-7; in addition, venality is made punishable by death. By treating venality as defilement of the land (11QT 51:14-15), the Temple Scroll continues an interpretation already characteristic of the Dtn redaction of Dt. 19–25.[433] 11QT 52:10 is based on Dt. 15:21-22, 11QT 55:15 on Dt. 17:2-3. The synecdochic use of *šaʿar* in 11QT 51:11; 52:10; 55:15 reflects similar usage in Deuteronomy. Interpreting Dt. 12 and Lev. 17,

---

431. Y. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, I (1977), 203-4.

432. On the assignment of names see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, I, 255-56; on the background of Hellenistic architecture see Lauter, 109ff.

433. Otto, "Soziale Verantwortung," *FS S. Herrmann*, 295-98.

11QT 52:14-15 (cf. also 53:4) augments the Dtn antithesis *māqôm — šaʿar* by adding *miqdāš — šaʿar.* 11QT 52:13-21 continues trends already noted in the interpretation of Dt. 12 in Lev. 17.[434]

11QT 64:1-6 and 65:7–66:12 incorporate ordinances of Dtn family law. The use of *šaʿar* in the sense of "court" in 11QT 64:4 and 66:10 reflects the usage of Deuteronomy. The Tgs. (Jon., Neof., Onq.) instead connect *šaʿar* in Dt. 17:5; 21:19; 22:15; 25:7 with the Beth Din[435] and expand it to *trʿ byt dyn(h) (ʾtrʾ)/by dynʾ.*

The usage of *šaʿar* in the Dead Sea Scrolls differs only slightly from OT usage. As the nature of the scrolls would lead us to expect, metaphorical usage predominates. A departure from OT usage appears in 4Q219 (Jub^{d}) 7:11 (= Jub. 39:9), where *šaʿar* is used like *peṯaḥ* to denote the door of an individual dwelling. In 4Q184 1 12 the city gates are identified specifically as *šʿry qrywt.* In 1QM 12:14 (= 4Q492 6) a prayer calls on Jerusalem to keep its gates always open. In 1QM 2:3 the gates of the sanctuary are called *šʿry hmqdš.* The camp has a primary gate *(hšʿr htykwn)* as well as secondary gates (1QM 8:4), which are opened before battle so that the warriors may sally forth. The opening of the "gates of battle" *(šʿry hmylḥmh)* in 1QM 3:1,7 and 16:4 serves also as a metaphor for the onset of battle; the opening of the "gates of help" *(šʿry yšwʿwt)* stands for God's help. The motif of the "gates of the netherworld" *(šʿry šʾl)* appears in 1QH 6:24 and 4Q184 1 10;[436] they are contrasted with the "everlasting gates" *(šʿry ʿlm).* In the benedictions for the days of the months in 4Q503 (3:15; 11:12; 12:20), the break of day is called the "gate of light" *(šʿr ʾwr).*

Otto

---

434. E. Otto, "Die Heiligkeitsgesetz Leviticus 17–26 in der Pentateuchredaktion," in P. Mommer and W. Thiel, eds., *AT, Forschung und Wirkung. FS H. Graf Reventlow* (Frankfurt am Main, 1994), 65-80.

435. Bab. *Ketub.* 45b.

436. See Jeremias, *TDNT,* VI, 925, for rabbinic citations.

שִׁפְחָה *šiphâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Lexical Field; 4. LXX. II. 1. Patriarchal Narratives; 2. Duties; 3. Self-Reference; 4. Legal Texts; 5. Wisdom Literature. III. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šiphâ. I. Cardellini, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts. BBB* 55 (1981), esp. 305-11; C. Cohen, "Studies in Extra-biblical Hebrew Inscriptions, I: The Semantic Range and Usage of the Terms אמה and שפחה," *Shnaton* 5 (1981)

I. 1. *Etymology.* A noun *šiphâ* is not attested in other Semitic languages. Ugar.[1] and Pun.[2] *šph,* "extended family," and OSA *s¹fḥ,* "call together,"[3] recall Heb. *mišpāḥâ.* Despite their phonetic resemblance, the two Hebrew nouns are unrelated etymologically. The proposed derivation from *šph,* "pour out"[4] (cf. Arab. *safaḥa*[5]), alluding to the activity of the *šiphâ,* remains highly hypothetical. In the SP the noun appears as *aš'fa.*

2. *Occurrences.* There are 60 occurrences of *šiphâ* in the OT. We may note a concentration in Gen. 12–35 (26 times), 2 S. 14 (6 times), and Jer. 34 (6 times). Its almost total absence from legal texts is noteworthy. The "slave laws" (Ex. 21:7,20,26,27; 23:12; Lev. 25:6,44; Dt. 15:17), the Decalog (Ex. 20:10,17; Dt. 5:14,21), and the Dtn list of those who participate in cultic observances (Dt. 12:12,18; 16:11,14) all use *'āmâ.* The fate of the *šiphâ* is a subject of prophetic social criticism only in Jer. 34.

3. *Lexical Field.* Eleven texts (Gen. 12:16; 20:14; 24:35; 30:43; 32:6[Eng. 5]; Dt. 28:68; 1 S. 8:16; 2 K. 5:26; Jer. 34:11; Eccl. 2:7; 2 Ch. 28:10) use *šiphâ* in syndesis with *'ebed.*[6] From this usage we may conclude that the *šiphâ* is an unfree female dependent of comparable status. The enslavement of both is denoted by *kābaš* (Jer. 34:11,16; 2 Ch. 28:10; cf. Neh. 5:5),[7] their manumission by *šlḥ ḥopšî* (Jer. 34:9; cf. Ex. 21:2; Dt. 15:12). Women may be enslaved by sale (Dt. 28:68; Est. 7:4; Eccl. 2:7) or as a result of war (Isa. 14:2).

The distinction between the nouns *'āmâ* and *šiphâ* is problematic. The former is somewhat less common (54 times) and appears primarily in legal texts. The similarity

---

25-53; F. Crüsemann, *The Torah* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1996); K. Engelken, *Frauen im Alten Israel. BWANT* 130 (1990); M. I. Finley, "Die Schuldknechtschaft," in H. G. Kippenberg, ed., *Die Entstehung der antiken Klassengesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main, 1977), 173-204; I. Fischer, *Die Erzeltern Israels. BZAW* 222 (1994); B. S. Jackson, "Biblical Laws of Slavery," in L. J. Archer, ed., *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labor* (London, 1988), 86-101; A. Jepsen, "AMA^H^ und SCHIPHCHA^H^," *VT* 8 (1958) 293-97; H. G. Kippenberg, "Die Entlassung aus Schuldknechtschaft im antiken Judäa," in G. Kehrer, ed., *"Vor Gott sind alle gleich"* (Düsseldorf, 1983), 74-104; idem, *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa. SUNT* 14 (²1982); N. P. Lemche, "The 'Hebrew Slave,'" *VT* 25 (1975) 129-44; idem, "The Manumission of Slaves — the Fallow Year — the Sabbatical Year — the Jobel Year," *VT* 26 (1976) 38-59; A. Phillips, "The Laws of Slavery," *JSOT* 30 (1984) 51-66; J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Slavery in the OT," *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971. SVT* 22 (1972), 72-87; I. Riesener, *Der Stamm* עבד *im AT. BZAW* 149 (1979), esp. 76-83; A. Schenker, "Affranchissement d'une esclave selon Ex 21,7-11," *Bibl* 69 (1988) 547-56; M. Schwantes, "A Literary Study of the Slave-girl Pericope — Leviticus 19:20-22," in S. Japhet, ed., *Studies in Bible. ScrHier* 31 (1986) 241-55; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). BZAW* 188 (1990).

1. *WUS,* no. 2664.
2. *DISO,* 316.
3. Beeston, 124.
4. *GesB,* 856.
5. Wehr, 409.
6. → X, 387-90.
7. → VII, 54-55.

however, are treated preferentially. The order in Jacob's demonstration of submissiveness (33:1,2,6) shows clearly that the *šiphâ* and her children have the lowest status. Ishmael, although born to a *šiphâ*, has the right of inheritance and thus endangers Isaac's position. Since Sarah lacks the authority within the family to cast out Hagar and Ishmael, she turns to Abraham and calls Hagar his *'āmâ* (21:10). Abraham's reaction in v. 11 shows that he is aware of the injustice he is committing when he accedes to Sarah's request to cast out Hagar and Ishmael.

Several theories have been put forward concerning the distinction between *'āmâ* and *šiphâ*. Jepsen refuted convincingly the older theory that the words belong to different source strata. He himself emphasizes the physical aspect, seeing in the *šiphâ* "an unfree girl, still virginal, whose primary function is to serve the wife; . . . **אמה** denotes an unfree woman, either the concubine of the husband or the unfree wife . . . of a slave."[14] This interpretation fails, however, in Gen. 25:12; 30:3-4; 32:23(22); Jepsen therefore assumes that the distinction was later lost. According to Riesener,[15] *šiphâ* places more emphasis on the aspect of capacity to work, *'āmâ* on the aspect of femininity. Engelken accepts this theory and concludes that there is a difference of status: "The **אמה** appears when the emphasis is on her close and intimate relationship to her mistress or master, on motherhood, sexual attractiveness, and the need for protection. The **שפחה** appears primarily when the emphasis is on her capacity to work and her enslavement."[16] In truth, a slight difference in status may be perceived in most texts. But the contrast between femininity and capacity to work[17] does not comport with the use of *'āmâ* in the Sabbath commandment, which concerns rest from labor; conversely, the surrogate mother texts use *šiphâ*, although their focus is on sexuality. The choice of terms appears instead to be determined by the nature of the relationship: texts dealing with the total family and the woman's relationship to the husband generally choose *'āmâ*. If her relationship to the mistress is to be expressed, the same person is called *šiphâ*.[18]

2. *Duties.* The work of a *šiphâ* is suggested above all by Ex. 11:5: she grinds grain. It is as characteristic for a *šiphâ* to sit behind the handmill as it is for the pharaoh to sit on his throne. Despite the significance of flour as a source of nutrition, this work was viewed as especially degrading; it was assigned to prisoners, for example (Jgs. 16:21; Isa. 47:1-2; Job 31:10). Other tasks of a *šiphâ* include fetching water (2 S. 17:17) and washing the feet of servants (1 S. 25:41); both services illustrate the low status of a *šiphâ*. The *šᵉpāḥôṯ* are the ones responsible for the "dirty work" (cf. in 1 S. 8 the difference between vv. 16 and 13).

3. *Self-Reference.* When directly addressing a king (Saul, David), a woman refers to herself as *šiphâ* in order to signal her submissiveness (1 S. 25; 28; 2 S. 14). Like the

14. P. 293.
15. Pp. 82-83.
16. Pp. 144-45.
17. For a fundamental criticism of this dubious categorization see Fischer, 95-96.
18. Fischer, 91-97.

self-designation *'eḇeḏ* (2 S. 9:11; 15:34; 18:29; 2 K. 16:7), this term by no means indicates that the speaker is a slave; it is an element of "court style."[19] The texts record diplomatic conversations.[20]

In 1 S. 25 and 2 S. 14 *šipḥâ* alternates with *'āmâ* within the direct address. In 2 S. 14 the change to *'āmâ* takes place in the woman's account of her own thoughts — *šipḥâ* is the more humble term, to which she reverts when the resume of her thoughts is over and she once more addresses the king directly. The same conclusion is suggested by 1 S. 25:41b, where Abigail offers to do service as a *šipḥâ.* A heightened sense of self can also explain why *'āmâ* is used as a self-designation in 2 S. 20:17 (the wise woman to Joab) and 1 K. 1:13,17 (Bathsheba to Solomon).

A similar usage appears in the conversations of Hannah with Eli (1 S. 18) and the disciple's wife with Elisha (2 K. 4:2,16). This slight nuance in the degree of submissiveness also comes into play in the interaction between Ruth and Boaz. In Ruth 2:13 she is asking a favor and therefore refers to herself submissively as *šipḥâ;* in 3:9 she is more demanding and therefore calls herself *'āmâ.*

The LXX takes an egalitarian tack, using *doúlē* for both terms in all these texts.

4. *Legal Texts.* Lev. 19:20 is the only instance of *šipḥâ* in a legal text.[21] This ordinance deals with sexual misconduct. From a strictly legal perspective, intercourse with a betrothed female slave involves neither adultery nor rape. Since, however, a wrong has been committed, a guilt offering is required (vv. 21-22).[22]

All other ordinances dealing with unfree females speak of the *'āmâ.* The Sabbath commandment (Ex. 20:10; Dt. 5:14) lists her among all those who are given respite from work. As in the lists of those who participate in cultic observances (Dt. 12:12,18; 16:11,14), she is viewed as part of the extended family of the head of the household (cf. Dt. 12:7). The commandment forbidding coveting (Ex. 20:17; Dt. 5:21) views her, along with real property, livestock, and chattels, as the property of a full citizen.[23] The "slave laws" proper deal with questions of bodily injury (Ex. 21:21-22,26-27) and manumission of male and female slaves (Ex. 21:2-11; Dt. 15:12-18). The addition of *'iḇrî* and *'iḇrîyâ* shows that these laws refer to Israelites who have been enslaved for debt.[24] Since daughters were the first to be sold into the form of dependence, women and girls were probably affected with particular frequency.[25] Because a female slave might be subject to sexual exploitation, the ordinance governing the manumission of an *'āmâ* differs from that governing the manumission of an *'eḇeḏ:* if he has had intercourse with her "owner" or his son, she may not be sold to another or sent away (Ex. 21:7-11). The other side of this "protective provision" is that, unlike the *'eḇeḏ,* the fe-

19. I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949), 68-72.
20. Riesener, 156-57.
21. See Cardellini, 305-11.
22. Engelken, 158.
23. F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 115.
24. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, 306-9.
25. Crüsemann, 157-59.

male slave had no chance to regain her freedom. If the owner takes another wife, he must not diminish the basic necessities provided for the *'āmâ.* These probably did not include sexual intercourse:[26] *'ōnâ* (Ex. 21:10)[27] should be translated "shelter" or "housing," not "intimacy."[28] Dt. 15 ameliorates the situation of a woman sold into slavery for debt; among the changes is the elimination of concubinage.[29]

Jer. 34 records a concrete instance of the manumission of male and female debtors. Departing from legal terminology, this text uses the term *šip̱ḥâ.* The clear reference to Dt. 15 betrays the Dtr redaction of Jeremiah. Eventually, the law came to prohibit the enslavement of an Israelite for debt (Lev. 25; 2 Ch. 28:10).[30]

5. *Wisdom Literature.* The texts that contrast *geḇîrâ* and *šip̱ḥâ* reflect the normal social order. The distance separating the two can serve as an image for the distance between God and the human individual (Ps. 123:2). When a *šip̱ḥâ* becomes mistress, the social order is imperiled (Prov. 30:23). Conversely, the fall from *geḇîrâ* to *šip̱ḥâ* is the greatest conceivable (Isa. 24:2). In Joel 3:2(2:29) revaluation of the social order becomes an eschatological vision: male and female slaves will be endowed with the spirit, just like sons and daughters.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. The contexts of 4Q266 14a 2 and 4Q270 8 14 are extremely fragmentary, making reconstruction very difficult. Since the texts are probably regulations concerning leprosy, it is safe to assume that the correct reading is the vb. *špḥ* rather than *šip̱ḥâ.*

Reuter

26. Engelken, 152.
27. → XI, 229.
28. Crüsemann, 157; Schwienhorst-Schönberger, 314 n. 44, translates it as "oil"!
29. Phillips, 55-62.
30. Riesener, 127-28.

שָׁפַט *šāpaṭ;* שֹׁפֵט *šōpēṭ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Ancient Near East; 3. Personal Names; 4. Occurrences; 5. Semantics; 6. LXX. II. Verb: 1. Rule; 2. Judge; 3. Do Justice; 4. Dispute. III. Noun: 1. Ruler; 2. Governor; 3. Judge; 4. Administration of Justice in Israel; 5. Judges of Israel; 6. Literary Influence. IV. Theological Usage: 1. Yahweh as Ruler; 2. Yahweh as Judge. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāpaṭ. P. Bovati, *Ristabilire la giustizia. AnBibl* 110 (1986), esp. 38-39, 154-55, 165-66; I. H. Eybers, *Die semitiese stam Š-P-Ṭ* (Pretoria, 1955); F. C. Fensham, "The Judges and Ancient Israelite Jurisprudence," *OTWSA* 2 (1960) 15-22; Y. Hocherman, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Language," *BethM* 30 (1984/85) 484-93; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), esp. 62-73; idem, "שׁפט *špṭ* to judge," *TLOT,* III, 1392-99; T. J. Mafico, "A Study of the Hebrew Root *špṭ* with Reference to Yahweh" (diss., Harvard, 1979); H. W. McAvoy, "A Study of the Root *ŠPṬ* with Special Reference to the Psalter" (diss., Edinburgh, 1973); H. Niehr, *Herrschen und Richten. FzB* 54 (1986); J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Šāpaṭ et Mišpāṭ," *OTS* 2 (1943) 144-55; M. Rozenberg, "The *Šōpᵉṭîm* in the Bible," *ErIsr* 12 (1975) 77*-86*; idem, "The Stem *špṭ*" (diss., Pennsylvania, 1963); A. van Selms, "The Title 'Judge,'" *OTWSA* 2 (1960) 41-50; J. J. Stamm, "Namen rechtlichen Inhalts," in H. Donner et al., eds., *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 460-78 = *Beiträge zur hebräischen und altorientalischen Namenkunde. OBO* 30 (1980), 159-77, esp. 168-77; M. Stol, "Akkadisches *šāpiṭum, šapāṭum* und westsemitisches *špṭ,*" *BiOr* 29 (1972) 276-77.

I.2.a: M. Anbar, *Les tribus Amurrites de Mari. OBO* 108 (1991); G. Bunnens, "Le sufète du port d'Emar," *Akkadica* Sup 6 (1989), 27-29; A. Finet, "Les autorités locales dans le royaume de Mari," *Akkadica* 26 (1982) 1-16, esp. 6-7; P. Fronzaroli, "L'ordinamento gentilizio semitico e i testi di Mari," *Archivio glottologico Italiano* 45 (1960), 37-60, esp. 52-54; H. Klengel, *Zwischen Zelt und Palast* (Vienna, 1972), esp. 103-45; J.-R. Kupper, "Mari. A. Philologisch," *RLA,* VII, 382-90, esp. 387-89; idem, "Les pouvoirs locaux dans le royaume de Mari," in A. Finet, ed., *Les pouvoirs locaux en Mésopotamie et dans les regions adjacentes* (Brussels, 1982), 43-53, esp. 45-47; J. T. Luke, "Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period" (diss., Michigan, 1965); T. J. Mafico, "The Term Šāpiṭum in Akkadian Documents," *JNSL* 13 (1987) 69-87; A. Marzal, "Mari Clauses in 'Casuistic' and 'Apodictic' Styles," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 333-64, 492-509; idem, "The Provincial Governor at Mari," *JNES* 30 (1971) 186-217; idem, "La raiz *špṭ (ŠIPṬUM, ŠAPĀṬUM, ŠĀPIṬUM, ŠĀPIṬŪTUM)* y las palabras *MERḪUM* y *ABU BĪTIM* en ARMT XIV," *Sefarad* 36 (1976) 221-39; V. H. Matthews, *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom (ca. 1830-1760 B.C.). ASORDS* 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1979); W. Mayer, "Grundzüge der Geschichte der Stadt Tuttul im 2. Jt. v.Chr.," *UF* 19 (1987) 121-60; C. van Nerom, "La fonction de šāpiṭum d'après les archives de Mari," *AIPHOS* 20 (1968/70) 505-10; E. Otto, *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im 'Bundesbuch'. OBO* 85 (1989); J. D. Safren, "*merḫum* and *merḫûtum* in Mari," *Or* 51 (1982) 1-29; idem, "New Evidence for the Title of the Provincial Governor at Mari," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 1-15.

I.2.b: W. F. Albright, "Zabûl Yam and Thâpiṭ Nahar in the Combat Between Baal and the Sea," *JPOS* 16 (1936) 17-20; H. Cazelles, "*mṯpṭ* à Ugarit," *Or* 53 (1984) 177-82 = *Autour de l'Exode* (Paris, 987), 167-74; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Mantik in Ugarit. Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästina* 3 (Münster, 1990) 226-40; F. C. Fensham, "The Ugaritic Root *ṯpṭ,*" *JNSL* 12 (1984) 63-69; P. J. van Zijl, *Baal. AOAT* 10 (1972), esp. 38-40.

I.2.d: W. Ameling, "Karthago," *Vestigia* 45 (1993) 67-117; E. Bacigalupo Pareo, "I supremi magistrati a Cartagine," *FS A. Garzetti* (Genoa, 1976), 61-87; G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée. Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes* 17

(Brussels, 1979), esp. 275-90; V. Ehrenberg, "Sufeten," *PW,* II/7 (1931), 643-51; M. Fantar, "A propos des institutions politiques et administratives de Carthage: la question de la royauté," *Actes du 1er congrès d'histoire et de la civilisation du Maghreb,* I (Tunis, 1979), 33-48; W. Huss, *Geschichte der Karthager. HAW* III/8 (1983), esp. 458-66; idem, "Der karthagische Sufetat," in H. Heinen et al., eds., *Altorientalische Studien. FS H. Bengtson. Historia Einzelschriften* 40 (Wiesbaden, 1983), 24-43; idem, "Eine republikanische Ära in Karthago?" in H. Calcyk et al., eds., *Studien zur alten Geschichte. FS S. Lauffer. Historica* 2 (1986), 439-42; idem, "Vier Sufeten in Karthago?" *Mus* 90 (1977) 427-33; H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre* (Jerusalem, 973), esp. 295-347; C. R. Krahmalkov, "Notes on the Rule of the *šōfṭīm* in Carthage," *RSF* 4 (1976) 153-57; E. Lipiński, "Suffète," *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique* (Paris, 1992), 429; G. C. Picard, "Le pouvoir suprême à Carthage," in E. Lipiński, ed., *Carthago. Studia Phoenicia* 6. *OLA* 26 (1988), 119-24; idem, "Les sufètes de Carthage dans Tite-Live et Cornelius Nepos," *Revue des études latines* 41 (1963) 269-81; P. C. Schmitz, "Epigraphic Contributions to a History of Carthage in the Fifth Century B.C.E." (diss., Michigan, 1990), esp. 193-217; M. Sznycer, "Carthage et la civilisation punique," in C. Nicolet, ed., *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen,* II. *NC* 8 (^{2}1988), i-x, 473-81, 545-93, esp. 565-76; J. Teixidor, "Les fonctions de *rab* et de suffète en Phénicie," *Sem* 29 (1979) 9-17.

III.4: R. Albertz, "Täter und Opfer im AT," *ZEE* 28 (1984), 146-66; E. Bellefontaine, "Customary Law and Chieftainship," *JSOT* 38 (1987) 47-72; Z. Ben-Barak, "The Appeal to the King as the Highest Authority for Justice," in M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck, eds., "Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden." *BEATAJ* 13 (1988), 169-77; H. J. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in Israel and the Ancient East* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1980), esp. 27-52; idem, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (^{2}1970); A. van den Born, "Rechtspflege," *BL*^{2}, 1457-58; J. Buchholz, *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium. GTA* 36 (1988), esp. 85-100; A. Cody, *History of the OT Priesthood. AnBibl* 35 (1969), esp. 120-23; F. Crüsemann, "Das Gericht im Tor," in J. Haussmann and H.-J. Zobel, eds., *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und biblische Theologie. FS H. D. Preuss* (Stuttgart, 1992), 69-79; idem, "Recht und Theologie im AT," in *Studien zu Kirchenrecht und Theologie,* I, ed. K. Schlaich (Heidelberg, 1987), 11-81, esp. 43-55; idem, *The Torah* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1996), esp. 59-107; H. Donner, "Studien zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der Reiche Israel und Juda" (diss., Leipzig, 1956), esp. 30-37, 70-74; F. Horst, "Gerichtsverfassung in Israel," *RGG*^{3}, II, 1427-29; idem, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 28 (1930) = *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 17-154; idem, "Recht und Religion im Bereich des AT," *EvT* 16 (1956) 49-75 = *Gottes Recht,* 260-91; E. Jenni, "Richter," *BHHW,* III, 1596-98; E. Junge, *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia. BWANT* 75 (1937), esp. 81-93; R. Kessler, *Staat und Gesellschaft im vorexilischen Juda. SVT* 47 (1992), esp. 161-89; R. Knierim, "Customs, Judges, and Legislators in Ancient Israel," in C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis. FS W. H. Brownlee* (Atlanta, 1987), 3-15; idem, "Exodus 18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 146-71; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1956), esp. 127-50; A. Lemaire, "Vengeance et justice dans l'Ancien Israël," in R. Verdier and J.-P. Poly, eds., *La vengeance,* III (Paris, 1984), 13-33; E. Lipiński, "The King's Arbitration in Ancient Near Eastern Folk-Tale," in K. Hecker and W. Sommerfeld, eds., *Keilschriftliche Literaturen. Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient* 6 (1986), 137-42; C. Locher, *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel. OBO* 70 (1986), esp. 83-116; C. Mabee, "David's Judicial Exoneration," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 89-107; idem, "Judicial Instrumentality in the Ahimelech Story," *FS W. H. Brownlee,* 17-32; G. C. Macholz, "Die Stellung des Königs in der israelitischen Gerichtsverfassung," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 157-82; idem, "Zur Geschichte der Justizorganisation in Juda," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 314-40; H. Niehr, "Grundzüge der Forschung zur Gerichtsorganisation Israels," *BZ* 31 (1987) 206-27; idem, *Rechtsprechung in Israel. SBS* 130 (1987); H. M. Niemann, *Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat. FAT* 6 (1993), esp. 174-84; M. Noth, "Das Amt des 'Richters Israels,'" in W. Baumgartner et al., eds., *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 404-17 = *GSAT. ThB* 39 (1969), 71-85; Y. Osumi, *Die*

I. 1. *Etymology.* The etymology of the root *špṭ* cannot be considered settled. Several derivations have been proposed:

a. If the first radical is considered a *šaph-* prefix, we arrive at a hollow root *puṭ/ṣ*, "scatter."[1] But note the absence of such a form in Wächter's study of shaphel forms[2] and the reservations expressed by van Zijl.[3]

Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB 18 (²1966); idem, "Zu den 'Richtern Israels,'" *ZAW* 77 (1965) 40-71; H. N. Rösel, "Jephtah und das Problem der Richter," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 251-55; idem, "Die 'Richter Israels,'" *BZ* 25 (1981) 180-203; C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, "Stadtstaat und Eidgenossenschaft in Max Webers Analyse der vorexilischen Gesellschaft," in W. Schluchter, ed., *Max Webers Studie über das antike Judentum* (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), 78-109; idem, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im AT. BZAW* 156 (1983); K.-D. Schunck, "Die Richter Israels und ihr Amt," *Volume du Congrès: Genève 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 252-62; J. A. Soggin, "Das Amt der 'Kleinen Richter' in Israel," *VT* 30 (1980) 245-48; W. Thiel, *Die soziale Entwicklung Israels in vorstaatlicher Zeit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, ²1985), esp. 65-145; T. L. Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East* 4 (Leiden, 1992), esp. 96-105; R. de Vaux, *Early History of Israel* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1978), esp. 751-73.

IV.2: R. D. Aus, "Gericht Gottes. II. Judentum," *TRE*, XII, 466-69; W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, III (Giessen, 1929), esp. 379-463; J. P. Brown, "Men of the Land and the God of Justice in Greece and Israel," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 376-402; H. Cazelles, "Le jugement des morts en Israël," *Le jugement des morts. Sources orientales* 4 (1961), 103-42; F. C. Fensham, "The Rôle of the Lord in the Legal Sections of the Covenant Code," *VT* 26 (1976) 262-74; A. Gamper, *Gott als Richter in Mesopotamien und im AT* (Innsbruck, 1966); R. M. Good, "The Just War in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 104 (1985) 385-400; J. G. Griffiths, *The Divine Verdict. Numen Sup* 52 (1991), esp. 3-25, 258-66, 289-312; idem, "The Idea of Posthumous Judgement in Israel and Egypt," in M. Görg, ed., *Fontes atque pontes. FS H. Brunner. ÄAT* 5 (1983), 186-204; R. L. Hubbard, "Dynamistic and Legal Processes in Psalm 7," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 267-79; B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils*, I. *WMANT* 59 (1989); K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *ZTK* 52 (1955) 1-42 = idem, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des AT. WdF* 125 (1972), 130-80; G. C. Macholz, "Gerichtsdoxologie und israelitisches Rechtsverfahren," *DBAT* 9 (1975) 52-60; M. F. Meadow, "The Motif of God as Judge in the OT" (diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986); K. Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge. JSOTSup* 9 (1978); E. von Nordheim, "Das Gottesurteil als Schutzordal für die Frau nach Numeri 5," in R. Bartelmus et al., eds., *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. FS K. Baltzer. OBO* 126 (1993), 297-309; E. Otto, "Kultus und Ethos in Jerusalemer Theologie," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 161-79; idem, "Die 'synthetische Lebensauffassung' in der frühköniglichen Novellistik Israels," *ZTK* 74 (1977) 371-400; J. Scharbert, "Jahwe im frühisraelitischen Recht," in E. Haag, ed., *Gott, der einzige. QD* 104 (1985), 160-83; W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 (²1966), esp. 36-43; J. Schreiner, "Eschatologie im AT," in M. Schmaus, ed., *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, IV/7a (Freiberg im Breisgau, 1986), 1-43; K. Seybold, "Gericht Gottes. I. AT," *TRE*, XII, 459-66; R. Smend, "Eschatologie. II. AT," *TRE*, X, 256-64; J. Theisohn, *Der ausgewählte Richter. SUNT* 12 (1975); K. van der Toorn, "Ordeal Procedures in the Psalms and the Passover Meal," *VT* 38 (1988) 427-45; J. Vella, *La giustizia forense di Dio. RivB Sup* 1 (1964); M.-T. Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht. FzB* 45 (²1985); E. F. de Ward, "Superstition and Judgment," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 1-19.

1. C. Labuschagne, "Original Shaph'el-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OT Studies. OTWSA* 10 (1967), 51-64, esp. 55-56.

2. L. Wächter, *ZAW* 83 (1971) 380-89.

3. P. 39.

b. Semantic analysis has suggested distinguishing two roots: *šapāṭu* I, "rule," and *šapāṭu* II, "threaten."[4]

c. Occasionally the root *špṭ* has been connected with *šbṭ*.[5]

d. On the basis of the close connection between the roots *swd* and *spd*,[6] *špṭ* has been understood as a *verbum dicendi* belonging to the word family *swd/spd*.[7]

Anticipating our semantic analysis, we may make the general statement that the vb. *špṭ* denotes an act of ruling or the exercise of authority, with further differentiation depending on the context.

2. *Ancient Near East.* The vb. *šāpaṭ* is a Northwest Semitic term denoting the exercise of power. This term was borrowed as a loanword by Akkadian.[8]

a. *Akkadian.* To date, derivatives of the root *špṭ* have not been found at Ebla. The title of the king's governors is written with the Sumerogram DI.KU$_5$, leaving open the question whether this stands for *dayyānu*[9] or for *šāpiṭum*. If the latter, it is still a matter of dispute whether this *šāpiṭum* is comparable to the judges of Israel[10] or is more like the *šāpiṭum* from Mari.[11]

The Mari letters contain the earliest occurrences of the root *špṭ*. Where it occurs, the vb. *špṭ* has as its subject an official or the king; it denotes an exercise of authority. With a personal direct object, *šapāṭum* means "give someone an order";[12] the same notion is expressed by the formula *šipṭam šapāṭum*.[13] The noun *šipṭu* means "command, order, edict." It refers to authoritative pronouncement of the king or a governor.[14]

The title *šāpiṭum* resists unambiguous definition, but the Mari letters enable us to approximate a notion of the office and function of a *šāpiṭum*. Some texts presuppose that a *šāpiṭum* functions officially in a city.[15] The *šāpiṭum* is subordinate to the *merḫum*, as is clear from the requirement that, to become a *merḫum*, one must have held the office of *šāpiṭum*.[16] The functions of a *šāpiṭum* include granting a trial,[17] or-

---

4. Stol; *AHw*, III, 1172; Mafico, *Study*, 27-28; *CAD*, XVII/1, 450-51; but cf. Marzal, *Sefarad* 36:222-23 n. 4.

5. Z. Falk, *Leš* 30 (1965/66) 243-47; S. Gevirtz, "On Hebrew *šēbeṭ*," in G. Rendsburg et al., eds., *Bible World. FS C. H. Gordon* (New York, 1980), 61-66; E. Kutscher, *Leš* 32 (1967/68) 274; P. V. Reid, *CBQ* 37 (1975) 17-20; but cf. S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 270-72.

6. M. Fraenkel, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 203 (1967) 127-31.

7. Niehr, *Herrschen*, 23-24.

8. Ibid., 19, with n. 5.

9. A. Archi, *Bibl* 60 (1979) 561; idem, *BA* 44 (1981) 150-51; L. Viganò, "Judges at Ebla," *SBFLA* 41 (1991) 303-10.

10. G. Pettinato, *BA* 39 (1976) 47; J. A. Soggin, *OrAnt* 19 (1980) 57-59.

11. P. Marrassini, *BiOr* 22 (1980) 205-6.

12. *ARM*, II, 92:13,20,24.

13. *ARM*, XIV, 48:10,18 (restored).

14. Marzal, *CBQ* 33; idem, *Sefarad* 36:224-28; Niehr, *Herrschen*, 36-40.

15. *ARM*, I, 18:21; XIV, 98:11-12; 112:5-6.

16. *ARM*, I, 62.

dering an arrest,[18] and administering a province.[19] One text,[20] in part restored, speaks of a *šāpiṭum* of the nomads of Hanum.[21] In this context the office of *šāpiṭum* has to do with enabling the nomadic and settled population to live side by side in Mari. That the *merḫum* also functions in this area[22] helps explain the overlapping responsibilities of the *šāpiṭum* and *merḫum*[23] as well as the requirement that only a *šāpiṭum* can become a *merḫum*.[24] The position of the *šāpiṭum* is denoted by the abstract noun *šāpiṭūtum*.[25]

The texts from Emar speak of a *šūpiṭu* (a by-form of *šāpiṭum*) of the Karum of Emar.[26] The *šūpiṭu* of the Karum was a high administrative official connected with Emar's commercial port, where he may have served as mediator between foreign merchants and the local residents.[27] In addition, a letter mentions the *šāpiṭum* of a village,[28] whose function was comparable to that of the *šāpiṭum* of the Karum, in that he was entrusted with management of commercial affairs.

I shall merely summarize the use of Assyrian and Babylonian derivatives of the root *špṭ*. The vb. *šapāṭu* appears primarily in Old Babylonian and Assyrian texts, with the meaning "determine, decide" and "rule." The title *šāpiṭu* is found mostly in Old Babylonian texts, where it refers to a high official or a ruler.[29] As a term meaning "judge," the title *šāpiṭum* appears only with reference to the sun god Shamash, who is "judge of gods and men."[30]

b. *Ugaritic*. Discussion of the semantics of the vb. *ṯpṭ* in Ugaritic literature moves between the poles of "reign" and "judge." The vb. *ṯpṭ* has the meaning "judge" in the sense of "do justice" in several texts,[31] where it always parallels the vb. *dn*, which clearly points to a forensic setting. The object is always a term denoting the downtrodden.

One text uses the parallel terms *yṯb*, "sit enthroned," and *ṯpṭ*, "reign," to describe Mlk, the king of the netherworld.[32] This interpretation is based on the understanding of Ashtaroth and Edrei as the seat of King Mlk's rule (Dt. 1:4; Josh. 12:4; 13:12; cf. Gen. 14:5; Nu. 21:33). Another interpretation of the vb. *ṯpṭ* in this passage takes it as an epi-

---

17. *ARM*, VIII, 84:4-5.
18. *ARM*, X, 160:16-17.
19. *ARM*, I, 62:10.
20. *ARM*, II, 98:12-13.
21. W. von Soden, *Or* 22 (1953) 200; M. Anbar, *MARI*, V, 643; but cf. idem, *Tribus*, 133.
22. Mayer, *UF* 19:153-57; idem, *UF* 21 (1989) 275-76.
23. *ARM*, XIV, 81:16.
24. *ARM*, I, 62.
25. *ARM*, I, 62:9; *šāpiṭum*, 81:17 (restored); *MARI*, II, 90; *CAD*, XVII/1, 459-60.
26. D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, VI/3 (Paris, 1986), no. 127, 2 (Mesk 753).
27. Bunnens, *Akkadica* Sup 6, 29.
28. D. Arnaud, *Aula Orientalis* 2 (1984) 181-82.
29. *AHw*, III, 1172-73; *CAD*, XVII/1, 450-51, 459; Niehr, *Herrschen*, 41-46.
30. *CAD*, XVII/1, 459.
31. *KTU* 1.16, VI, 33-34, 46-47; 1.17, V, 7-8.
32. *KTU* 1.108, 2-3.

thet of the god Mlk. Since Mlk is viewed as an answerer of questions through oracles, here *ṯpṭ* would mean "give a decision through an oracle, decide."[33]

The title *ṯpṭ* is given to the gods Baal and Nhr. In these cases there is no useful context to help interpret the title, and scholars have therefore proposed either "ruler" or "judge." The use of *mlk* as a parallel term[34] suggests the meaning "ruler," as does the parallel use of *zbl*.[35] There are other occurrences of the title *ṯpṭ* without *mlk* or *zbl* in parallel.[36]

c. *Phoenician-Punic.* In Phoenician and Punic inscriptions the vb. *špṭ* appears with the meaning "rule."[37] The noun *mšpṭ*, "dominion," is related.[38] We also find *špṭ* used in the sense of "punish."[39]

The title *špṭ*, "suffete," given to the chief magistrate of Carthage, derives from *špṭ* in the sense of "rule." Many scholars assume the existence of a monarchy in Carthage from its founding (814 B.C.E.) until the 5th century, although there is no direct evidence. The reasons for introducing the office of suffete are obscure, but one plausible theory sees a shift of authority from the king to the aristocracy, a shift that eventually resulted in the replacement of the king by the suffetes. If Carthage was originally a commercial colony of Tyre, the analogy of the *šāpiṭum* of Emar suggests interpreting the suffetes as the administrators of a society of merchants.[40] This interpretation, however, is not undisputed.[41]

At Carthage the term "suffete" appears primarily in the eponym formulas *bšt špṭm*, *byrḥ špṭm*, and *(b)ʿt špṭm*, followed by the names of the incumbents.[42] Some Neo-Punic examples of the eponym formula suggest the addition of a date, since they use *špṭm* + PN analogously to Lat. *consulibus* + PN.[43] As to the number of suffetes holding office at any one time, the evidence varies between two and four. The eponym formula *bšt X špṭm*, "in year X of the suffetes," indicates that they were (re)appointed annually. The suffetes were the highest officials in the government of Carthage; the title is therefore translated *rex*, *consul*, or *basileús*, more rarely *dikastḗs*. The responsibilities of the suffetes included oversight of the judicial and financial systems and supervision of the police; they influenced legislation and convoked the senate and the popular assembly. Military matters were not within their area of competence; for this the *stratēgós* was responsible. Suffetes also appear in Phoenician colonies throughout the Mediterranean region.[44]

---

33. Dietrich and Loretz, 229; but see again O. Loretz, *TRev* 88 (1992) 364.
34. *KTU* 1.3, V, 32-33; 1.4, IV, 43-44.
35. *KTU* 1.2, I, 6-7 (restored); III, 8-9 (restored), 20-23 (restored); IV, 14-17, 22, 24-25, 29-30.
36. *KTU* 1.2, I, 17 (restored), 22, 26, 28, 30, 33-34, 44, 45-46; III, 7; IV, 27.
37. *CIS*, I, 5632, 4.
38. *KAI* 1.2.
39. *KAI* 79.10-11 = *CIS*, I, 3785, 10-11; 4937, 4-6; 5632, 7-8.
40. Bunnens, *Expansion*, 275-90; idem, *Akkadica* Sup 6, 29.
41. C. R. Krahmalkov, *BASOR* 249 (1983) 92-94.
42. *CIS*, I, 3920, 3; 5523, 3; *KAI* 66.2; 69.1; 77.3; 81.5-6; 96.3; 119.3; 130.1; 137.1; 173.3.
43. *CIS*, I, 135, 6; *KAI* 122.2-3; 146.4-5; cf. also *CIS*, I, 5632, 4; *KAI* 159.5-6.
44. See the citations in *DISO*, 316.

8:16;[60] *mālak̠*, 2 Ch. 1:10-11) and juridical authority (*byn* hiphil *bên*, 1 K. 3:9; *dbr ᵓᵉmet̠*, Zec. 8:16; *dbr ṣdq*, Ps. 58:2[Eng. 1]; *dîn*, Jer. 5:28; Prov. 31:9; *zkr* hiphil, Isa. 43:26; *ykḥ* hiphil, Isa. 2:4; 11:3-4; Mic. 4:3; *yšʿ*, Ps. 72:4; *nāqam min*, 1 S. 24:13; *ṣdq* hiphil, Dt. 25:1 [cf. 1 K. 8:32]; Ps. 82:3; *rîb̠*, 1 S. 24:16[15]; Isa. 1:17; Ps. 43:1 [cf. Jer. 25:31]; *ršʿ* hiphil, Dt. 25:1 [cf. 1 K. 8:32; Ps. 37:33; 109:7]; *šāmaʿ bên*, Dt. 1:16). We may accordingly state the meaning of *šāp̄aṭ* qal to be "rule, lead, govern" and "judge, determine, grant justice." Thus the semantic spectrum of the root *špṭ* already observed in East, Northwest, and South Semitic is maintained in Hebrew as well.

b. *Noun.* An initial semantic definition of the title *šōp̄ēṭ* may be derived from titles with which it is parallel. In the first instance, these are titles indicating the exercise of sovereignty (*melek̠*, Isa. 33:22; Hos. 7:7; 13:10; Ps. 2:10; 148:11; *rōzēn*, Isa. 40:23). Other titles are associated with administrative and military contexts (*yōʿēṣ*, Isa. 1:26; Job 12:17; *kōhēn*, Dt. 17:9,12; 19:17; *mᵉḥōqēq*, Isa. 33:22; *śar*, Ex. 2:14; Am. 2:3; Mic. 7:3; Zeph. 3:3; Ps. 148:11; *šōṭēr*, Dt. 16:18; 29:9 [text?]; Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1; 1 Ch. 23:4; 26:29). Finally, terms associated with clan organization appear together with *šōp̄ēṭ* (*zāqēn*, Dt. 21:2; 29:9 [text?]; Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1; Isa. 3:2; Ezr. 10:14; *rōʾš*, Dt. 29:9 [text?]; Josh. 23:2; 24:1). The title *šōp̄ēṭ* can therefore denote the office of a ruler or an official, as well as a rank in clan organization.

6. *LXX.* The LXX most often uses *krínein* to translate *šāp̄aṭ*. We also find the vbs. *dikázein* (1 S. 7:6,15-17; 8:5,6,20; 24:13,16[12,15]) and *ekdikeín* (1 S. 3:13; Ezk. 7:27; 16:38; 20:4; 23:24,45; Ob. 21). The title *šōp̄ēṭ* is usually translated as *krítēs*, occasionally as *dikastḗs* (Ex. 2:14; Josh. 23:2; 1 S. 8:1; Isa. 3:2). In Nu. 25:5; Mic. 4:14(5:1); 1 Ch. 17:6, the LXX read *šēb̠eṭ* rather than *šōp̄ēṭ* and therefore used *phýlē*. Only in Isa. 40:23 is *šōp̄ēṭ* translated as *archṓn*. Thus the LXX adheres closely to the forensic aspect of *šāp̄aṭ* and *šōp̄ēṭ*; except in Isa. 40:23, the aspect of sovereignty does not appear.

II. Verb. 1. *Rule.* In a few pre-Dtr passages within DtrH, the vb. *šāp̄aṭ* in the syntagm *šāp̄aṭ ʾet̠-yiśrāʾēl* refers to the exercise of a leadership office in the premonarchic period (Jgs. 10:2,3; 12:7-15). Since *šāp̄aṭ* has no discernible forensic connotation in these texts, it should be translated "lead" or "rule." This holds true also for other passages that are influenced by these: Jgs. 3:10; 4:4; 15:20; 16:31; 1 S. 4:18; 7:15; 2 K. 23:22; Ruth 1:1.

Exercise of authority is also intended in Gen. 19:9, where Lot is the subject of the *figura etymologica šāp̄aṭ šāp̄ôṭ*, "act like someone in charge."

In Prov. 8:16 *šāp̄aṭ ʾereṣ* should be read, with several mss.,[61] so that we have *śārar* and *šāp̄aṭ* used in parallel in the general sense of "rule." Hos. 13:10 is similar: the vb. *šāp̄aṭ* refers to the governance of the king and his officials.[62]

Other passages show that the governance expressed by the vb. *šāp̄aṭ* can be conceived as monarchic. According to 1 S. 8:5-6,20, the Israelites ask for a king to govern

60. See *BHK/BHS*.
61. See *BHS*.
62. See *BHK/BHS*.

III. Noun.

1. *Ruler.* In continuity with the use of the title *ṯpṭ* at Ugarit[74] and in agreement with the aspect of exercise of sovereignty expressed by the vb. *šāpaṭ*,[75] the title *šōpēṭ* can be used in Israel for the ruler of a state. This usage can refer to a foreign ruler, e.g., the ruler of Moab (Am. 2:3), but also to all the rulers of the earth (Isa. 40:23; Ps. 2:10; 148:11). In Hos. 7:7 *šōpᵉṭîm* and *mᵉlāḵîm* in parallel denote the kings of the northern kingdom who lost their thrones through revolutions. It is unlikely that this passage is speaking of judges. With reference to Judah, the title *šōpēṭ yiśrā'ēl* (Mic. 4:14[5:1]) means the king of the southern kingdom. On the basis of this text, Noth has attempted to reconstruct a premonarchic "judge of Israel," who held an office of leadership and juridical authority over all Israel.[76] Niehr has criticized this use of Mic. 4:14(5:1) as evidence concerning premonarchic institutions.[77]

The title of *šōpēṭ* for a ruler can also be given to Yahweh, who is referred to as *šōpēṭ (kol-)hā'āreṣ* (Gen. 18:25; Ps. 94:2).

2. *Governor.* At Mari and Emar *šāpiṭum* can denote a governor or administrative official.[78] This usage may be the origin of the office of suffete at Carthage and Tyre.[79] Two texts indicate that a *šōpēṭ* in Israel might play a similar role.

According to 2 S. 15:4, Absalom longed for the office of *šōpēṭ bā'āreṣ*, so as to be able to decide all the suits that the king could not hear (v. 3). In other words, Absalom wished to become a kind of governor,[80] representing in the capital before the king the concerns of the Judahites and Israelites outside Jerusalem.

That such a role could be played by a *šōpēṭ* in Judah is shown by 2 K. 15:1-5. Since King Azariah of Judah was leprous, he lived in a separate house; his son Jotham was master of the palace, governing *(šāpaṭ)* the people of Judah.[81] Thus Jotham was in charge of domestic affairs; only after the death of his father did he become king (v. 7).

3. *Judge.* The use of the title *šōpēṭ* for a judge first appears in the laws regulating officials in Deuteronomy. Dt. 16:18 requires the people to appoint judges and *šōṭᵉrîm* to render just decisions for the people. According to Dt. 17:8-11, a case too difficult for the local court, involving bloodguilt, violation of social norms, or bodily injury, is to be brought to Jerusalem to be judged by the priests and the judge.

---

74. See I.2.b above.
75. See II.1 above.
76. Noth, "Amt."
77. *BZ* 31:208-9, with n. 13.
78. See I.2.a above.
79. See I.2.c above.
80. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung*, 73-74.
81. On the semantics of *'am hā'āreṣ* see C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja. SBS* 105 (1982), 66-69.

Other legal texts in Deuteronomy describe the function of judges in greater detail. Dt. 19:16-21 assumes that judges serve on a court. Their task is to conduct an inquiry[82] in a legal case. If the court decides that the guilty party is to be flogged, the judge is to see that the penalty is inflicted (25:1-3). If an unidentified person is murdered outside the city, in open country, the elders and judges are to go out to determine which town is closest to the location of the crime (21:2).

Outside Deuteronomy *šōpēṭ* may be understood in the sense of "judge" in Mic. 7:3; Zeph. 3:3; Job 9:24. These texts, however, focus solely on the corruption of incumbent judges and say nothing about the judge's role in the administration of justice. Similarly unproductive for elucidating the judicial office are the references to judges in Isa. 1:26 and Job 12:17, which mention judges in parallel with counselors; Ezr. 10:14, where judges appear in parallel with elders; and Job 9:15;[83] Ps. 109:31; 141:6.

In DtrH the retrojection of *šōpᵉṭîm* in the sense of "judges" into the tribal organization of the premonarchic period is an anachronism (Dt. 1:16; 29:9;[84] Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1). From DtrH this notion also found its way into Nu. 25:5. None of these texts gives any details about the office of judge and the judge's function in the tribal organization; they merely postulate the existence of judges in the premonarchic period.

The mention of judges in this period is meant to show that Israel entered its land not as a random group but already constituted as "God's people."[85] The purpose of legitimation is also served by connecting the formal judicial office, newly created in the time of Josiah, with the premonarchic structures of Israel. The primary text is Ex. 18:13-27, where officers are appointed judges over the people.[86] Dt. 1:15-16, too, reveals traces of the military background of the office of judge.[87] All these texts develop the theme of Moses as judge and lawgiver.[88]

Other anachronisms appear in Chronicles, which speaks of judges and *šōṭᵉrîm* among the Levites of the First Temple (1 Ch. 23:4) and identifies judges and *šōṭᵉrîm* in David's administration, with responsibility for external affairs (1 Ch. 26:29). Chronicles also believes that there were judges in the period of Solomon (2 Ch. 1:2). King Jehoshaphat is said to have appointed judges in all the fortified cities of Judah and to have established a court in Jerusalem (2 Ch. 19:4-11). The historical accuracy of these texts cannot be verified, especially the supposed legal reform of Jehoshaphat described in 2 Ch. 19:4-11.

Any analysis of 2 Ch. 19:4-11 must take seriously the Chronistic characteristics of

---

82. → דרשׁ *dāraš*.

83. On the poel participle see *GK*, §55b; *BLe*, §38j; JM, §59a.

84. On the reading *šēḇeṭ* see C. Begg, "The Reading *šbṭy(km)* in Deut 29,9 and 2 Sam 7,7," *ETL* 58 (1982) 87-105.

85. L. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium. BK* V/1 (1990), 60-61.

86. → XIV, 209-10.

87. H. Cazelles, "Institutions et terminologie en Deutéronome i 6-17," *Volume du Congrès: Genève 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 109.

88. D. Timpe, *Saeculum* 31 (1980) 66-77; H. Schmid, *Die Gestalt des Mose. EdF* 237 (1986), 75-79; Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 123-24.

the text before attempting to use it as a source for the history of Israelite law.[89] Some have minimized these characteristics in order to establish an historical basis for the events described in 19:4-11.[90] These attempts are not convincing from the perspective of the literary analysis of Chronicles;[91] neither do they do justice to the history of Israelite law, since there is no evidence for the existence of royal judges as early as the 9th century. Furthermore, this text cannot be used to explain the origin of the Covenant Code; such an explanation ignores the connection between legal collections and schools.[92]

4. *Administration of Justice in Israel.* In the period before the establishment of the monarchy, we can identify three different spheres within which the administration of justice took place: within the family, through the paterfamilias (Gen. 16:1-6; 31:25-53; 38:24-26; Ex. 21:2-6,7-11); at the local level, through the elders,[93] who were drawn from the heads of families (Ex. 21:18-19,28-32; 22:1-14[2-15]; 23:1-3,6-8; Jgs. 6:25-32); and finally through priests (1 S. 2:25).

These juridical spheres were preserved after the establishment of the monarchy, albeit with some change: elements of the juridical authority of the paterfamilias within the family were shifted to the local courts, strengthening the authority of the elders. This development indicates that the power of the local courts increased.

The juridical authority of the newly established monarchy emerges from two roots. Insofar as the monarchy relies on armed forces, the jurisdictional authority of their commander is extended (1 S. 14:24-46; 30:21-25; 2 S. 1:1-16). In addition, a royal administration develops, based and modeled on the royal household,[94] so that the king assumes the juridical competence of a paterfamilias (1 S. 22:6-23; 2 S. 19:25-31[24-30]; 1 K. 2:13-25,26-27,28-35). A new element is the personal jurisdiction of the king (2 S. 15:1-6; 2 K. 8:1-6; Jer. 26:1-19). This was necessary, since the establishment of the monarchy resulted in new legal constellations that required decisions. In addition, the monarchy sought to bring as many areas as possible under its own control. Thus the monarchy also made use of juridical structures to pursue its own goals (2 S. 1:1-16; 4; 1 K. 2:13-25,26-27,28-35,36-46; 21:1-29). This development went hand in hand with a centralization of juridical authority in the capital and the towns,[95] as is evident above all from the texts that speak of judges (Dt. 16:18; 17:8-13; 21:2; 2 S. 15:1-5).

Partly on the basis of certain reflections by Alt,[96] some have claimed that the capital cities Jerusalem and Samaria had a special status in the administration of justice, in

---

89. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 121-22.

90. F. Crüsemann, "Das Bundesbuch," *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986. SVT* 40 (1988), 35-40; idem, *Torah,* 90-98; Reviv, *Elders,* 102-12; Osumi, 140-43.

91. P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 5-6, 184-85; K. Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation. BZAW* 201 (1991), 171-76.

92. Otto, *Körperverletzungen,* 175-87.

93. → זקן *zāqēn.*

94. → XIV, 199-200.

95. → XI, 57-58.

96. A. Alt, *KlSchr,* III (1959), 243-57, 258-302.

that the local royal court replaced the court of the elders.[97] But fundamental considerations regarding the role of Jerusalem and Samaria argue against this claim,[98] as do the very legal texts cited in its support.[99]

There is no evidence for the existence of judges as a distinct profession before Josiah. The royal administration of justice was in the hands of officials[100] (Isa. 1:23). The tendency to entrust the administration of justice to officials is most evident in texts from the time of Josiah (Jer. 26:1-19; 37:11-16). In the context of the military buildup under Josiah, officers[101] were also called on to oversee the administration of justice (Ex. 18:13-27), a function confirmed by a legal petition from Mesad Hashavyahu,[102] which shows that, in the period shortly after Josiah,[103] judicial authority in a royal garrison was exercised by a military governor *(śar).*

Alongside these officials, an independent judiciary was established. The most important evidence is provided by the Dtn laws relating to officials, including judges (Dt. 16:18; 17:8-13; 19:16-21; 25:1-3), and the appearance of judges in prophetic texts (Isa. 1:26; Mic. 7:3; Zeph. 3:3). Only the laws in Deuteronomy have anything to say about the duties of these judges.[104]

That the *šōpēṭ* first appears as a professional judge in the time of Josiah is connected with general features distinguishing the political and constitutional history of Judah and Israel. The first period in which one can speak of an actual state is the Iron IIC period (ca. 850-586), a development due to Assyrian pressure on Judah.[105] Archaeologically, too, this period marks the first appearance of an independent Israel and Judah.[106] Now there appears in Judah a political administration in which important functions are centralized,[107] a development characterized by the spread of literacy in Palestine, beginning in the mid-8th century.[108] At the end of the 7th century, King Josiah established an independent judiciary as one of his reform measures, which aimed primarily at administrative centralization. This judiciary gave the king and his administration a handle on the local court system, which had hitherto been adminis-

---

97. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 72 n. 178, with bibliog.

98. S. Timm, *Die Dynastie Omri. FRLANT* 124 (1982), 142-56; Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Stadt,* 381-417; H. Tadmor, "Some Aspects of the History of Samaria during the Biblical Period," *Jerusalem Cathedra* 3 (1983) 1-11.

99. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 72-76.

100. → שׂר *śar.*

101. → XIV, 205-7.

102. *KAI* 200.

103. R. Wenning, "Mesad Hašavyahu," in F.-L. Hossfeld, ed., *Vom Sinai zum Horeb. FS E. Zenger* (Würzburg, 1989), 169-96.

104. See III.3 above.

105. E. A. Knauf, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 19 (Oxford, 1989) 79-80, 82-83.

106. H. Weippert, *Handbuch der Archäologie,* II/1 (Munich, 1988), 559-681.

107. D. W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah. JSOTSup* 109 (1991), 138-45.

108. A. R. Millard, "Assessment of the Evidence for Writing in Ancient Israel," in J. Aviram, ed., *Biblical Archaeology Today* (Jerusalem, 1985), 301-12; Weippert, *Handbuch,* 578-87.

tered by the elders. It also affected the existing sacral courts at temples and sanctuaries throughout the land.[109] Besides capitalizing on the forensic connotations of the vb. *šāpaṭ,* the description of the new judges as *šōpᵉṭîm* may also be understood as a revival of the office of governor, to secure the interests of the populace within the royal administration.[110]

After the fall of Judah in 586, the royal court system ceased to exist. The judicial system was once more in the hands of full citizens or elders (Zec. 7:9; 8:16; Ruth 4:1-12), organized in part on the basis of extended families (Ezr. 10:16-17). In addition, there was provision for judgment by the congregation (Nu. 35:9-34; Josh. 20:1-9; Ps. 1:5). Inasmuch as the priesthood replaced the monarchy, priests came to have more influence on the administration of justice (Lev. 17–26; Nu. 5:11-31; Dt. 17:8-13; 21:5; Ezk. 44:24; 2 Ch. 19:4-11; cf. Zec. 3:7).

The actual course of court proceedings in Israel is nowhere recorded. Reconstruction can draw on evidence from Gen. 16:1-6; 31:25-53; 38:24-26; Nu. 5:11-31; Dt. 21:18-21; 25:1-3; 1 S. 22:11-17; 1 K. 4:42-46; 3:16-28; 21:1-29; Jer. 26:1-19; Ruth 4:1-22; Susanna (Dnl. 13 LXX). Almost certainly, however, we must take into account varying local forms of court proceedings in the legal history of Israel.[111]

5. *Judges of Israel.* A list of "judges of Israel" is recorded in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15; it was extended secondarily to include a larger circle (Jgs. 2:16-19; 3:10; 4:4; 15:20; 16:31; 1 S. 4:18; 7:15; 8:1; 2 S. 7:7,11; 2 K. 23:22; Ruth 1:1). This list provides the basis for the assumption that there was a "period of the judges." The meager literary evidence, which says nothing about the nature of the leadership exercised by the judges, has occasioned a wealth of theories.

On the basis of Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15, Alt and Noth proposed the theory of a premonarchic office of judge, with authority throughout all Israel.[112] On the basis of a suggestion by Klostermann, Alt had taken as a model the Icelandic office of lawgiver. Noth looked to the model of the Greek and Italian amphictyonies; he linked the amphictyony with the office of "judge of Israel," which he found in Mic. 4:14(5:1). Richter instead set the lists in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 in the context of early royal annals; he based his conception of the judges of Israel on a study of the root *špṭ,* which led him to define *šāpaṭ* and *šōpēṭ* as terms denoting the exercise of sovereignty.[113] He defined the judges of Israel as "individuals from a city or tribe, appointed by the (tribal) elders to exercise civil authority and administer justice in a city and the surrounding countryside, representatives of a transitional order between tribal and municipal administration."[114]

---

109. See IV.2 below; also Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 80-91.

110. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 95-96.

111. On the attempts to reconstruct the individual elements of a typical trial, see ibid., 53-54 n. 94, with bibliog.

112. A. Alt, *KlSchr,* I (1953), 278-332, esp. 300-302; Noth, "Amt."

113. *ZAW* 77.

114. P. 53.

More recent models explaining the period of the judges are based on the concept of a segmented society.[115] Since segmented societies lack a central leadership office, the leadership described in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 cannot be understood as embracing all Israel. If the application of the segmented society model to premonarchic Israel is problematic, even more so is the attempt to connect this model with the concept of the "judge of Israel."[116] Equally untenable is the attempt to compare the relationship between the settled and nomadic populations at Mari to premonarchic Israel, since it ignores the totally different conditions in Palestine and the central Euphrates region.[117]

All that we may conclude from the lists in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 is that a pre-Dtn tradition of uncertain date knows of an office exercising leadership over an otherwise undefined entity called Israel. The burial locations appear to limit this office to the core region of Israel in Ephraim. The technical term for the exercise of this office is *šāpaṭ*. The succession of officeholders represents a literary device to impose a pan-Israelite scope on the exercise of this office *(šāpaṭ)*. The evidence of the sources does not allow a decision whether (a) this term was chosen to establish a linguistic distinction between this office and the later monarchy, or (b) there is a foundation in fact for a kind of leadership over Israel before 1000 B.C.E. termed *šāpaṭ*. Positive arguments for the possibility of a *šōpēṭ* office in premonarchic Israel include the existence of the *šāpiṭum* at Emar in the Late Bronze period[118] and the office of suffete in the Phoenician-Punic cities during the Iron Age, as well as the office of governor in Israel (2 S. 15:4; 2 K. 15:5). On the other hand, the 14th-century Amarna letters know nothing of such an office in Palestine.

6. *Literary Influence.* a. *DtrH.* In Jgs. 2:11-19 the term *šōpēṭ* denotes a leadership office of the premonarchic period. This text is based on the lists in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15, where the syntagm *šāpaṭ 'eṯ-yiśrā'ēl* occurs. Jgs. 2:11-19 clearly illustrates the Dtr view of the title *šōpēṭ*. The schema comprising the elements "apostasy from Yahweh — distress — lamentation — sending of a *šōpēṭ* — restoration of peace" displays a forensic connotation of the title *šōpēṭ*. The *šōpēṭ* reestablishes justice for Israel and can therefore also be called *môšîa'*.[119] Here we have a deliberate blueprint for a central leadership office in the premonarchic period. The Deuteronomists did not, however, invent the title *šōpēṭ;* they had as prototypes the *šōpēṭ* as governor (2 S. 15:1-5; 2 K. 15:1-5) and above all the office of judge, newly created in the Josianic reform. The Deuteronomists connect this office with the material in the pre-Dtr lists in Jgs. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 and retroject the judicial office of the Josianic administration into the premonarchic period. This tendency appears in other Dtr texts as well, which import a forensic connotation into a premonarchic leadership office (Jgs. 4:4-5; 1 S. 7:6,16-17; cf. 8:1-3).

115. F. Crüsemann, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum. WMANT* 49 (1978), 194-222; M. Clauss, *Chiron* 10 (1980) 1-33, esp. 9-21; R. Neu, *BZ* 30 (1986) 204-21.

116. P. Mommer, *Samuel, Geschichte und Überlieferung. WMANT* 65 (1991), 211-22.

117. E. A. Knauf, *Ismael* (Wiesbaden, [2]1989), 42-43, 142-43.

118. See I.2.a above.

119. Becker, 96-98.

Other texts in DtrH also assume a "period of the judges." Samuel appoints his sons as *šōpᵉṭîm* (1 S. 8:1). Their location in Beer-sheba (v. 2) and the existence of two incumbents simultaneously mark the difference from the Dtr conception of the judge. A rather vague "period of the judges" is mentioned in 2 S. 7:7,11. The task of "shepherding the people," which v. 7 ascribes to the judges (with 1 Ch. 17:6; another reading is *šēḇeṭ*[120]), actually describes the office of the king.[121] In 2 K. 23:22 the history of Israel is divided into the days of the judges and the days of the kings.

b. *Other Books.* Without any clear reference to the Dtr concept, Ruth 1:1 assumes the existence of a period of the judges. In this context it is also worth noting the evidence of Samaritan Chronicle II, which uses the root *mlk* to describe the leadership role of the judges of Israel.[122]

IV. Theological Usage. The broad semantic range exhibited by the vb. *šāpaṭ* and the title *šōpēṭ* is also characteristic of the passages that apply the verb and the title to Yahweh.

1. *Yahweh as Ruler.* When the vb. *šāpaṭ* has as its obj. *tēḇēl* (Ps. 9:9[8]; 67:5[4][following LXX]; 96:13; 98:9) or *'ereṣ* (Ps. 82:8; 96:13; 98:9; 1 Ch. 16:33), it likewise refers to the establishment of righteousness and justice. In this context Koch[123] interprets *šāpaṭ* as "righten," Jeremias[124] as "an intervention establishing order" on the part of Yahweh. A more precise understanding of this expression can be gained by comparing *šāpaṭ 'ereṣ/ tēḇēl* with the expression *mātam šutēšuru* (primarily Neo-Assyrian), which refers to the prosperity that the king brings to the land.[125] A comparable OT syntagm is *šāpaṭ mêšārîm* (Ps. 75:3[2]), to be understood as the ruler's establishment of a just and righteous order.

The sovereign role of Yahweh expressed by this usage also appears in the assignment to Yahweh of the title *šōpēṭ kol-hā'āreṣ* (Gen. 18:25; Ps. 94:2), which is not limited to a forensic setting.

2. *Yahweh as Judge.* In the ancient Near East the divine judge par excellence is the sun god, from whom nothing is hidden and from whom justice goes forth. The sun god plays this role in Egypt,[126] Mesopotamia,[127] Asia Minor,[128] and Syria-Palestine.[129]

---

120. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, I. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 245-46; Begg, *ETL* 58 (1982) 87-105; idem, *RB* 95 (1988) 551-58.

121. → XIII, 551.

122. J. Macdonald, *Samaritan Chronicle No. II. BZAW* 107 (1969), 34-41.

123. K. Koch, *TLOT,* II, 1056-57.

124. J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987), 129.

125. *CAD,* IV, 359-60; *AHw,* I, 255-56.

126. J. Assmann, *Re und Amun. OBO* 51 (1983), 71-80, 176-78, 274-77, 280; W. Barta, *LexÄg,* V, 160-61; Janowski, 112-74.

127. D. O. Edzard, *WbMyth,* I, 126-27; Gamper, 59-96; Janowski, 30-98; B. Langer, *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien. ÖBS* 7 (1989), 161-73, 198-202.

128. E. von Schuler, *WbMyth,* I, 196-201; W. Fauth, *UF* 11 (1979) 227-63; Janowski, 98-112.

129. A. Caquot, *Syr* 36 (1959) 90-101; C. Bonnet, *SEL* 6 (1989) 97-115; E. Lipiński, *OLP* 22 (1991) 57-72.

In Israel too there is evidence for the notion of the sun god as judge; some of the texts transfer this role to Yahweh (Gen. 19:15-26; 32:23-33[22-32]; Ex. 17:8-16; Josh. 10:12-14; Jgs. 9:33; 19:14-26; 1 S. 11:9-11). In this incipient solarization of Yahweh, Yahweh takes on the god's role as judge and is himself referred to as the sun (Mal. 3:20[4:2]; Ps. 84:12[11]).[130] Yahweh bears the forensic title *šōpēṭ,* "judge," in Jgs. 11:27; Ps. 7:12(11); 9:5(4); 50:6; 58:12(11); 75:8(7); 94:2.

Yahweh is often also the plaintiff who takes his adversary to court. This forensic action is denoted by the niphal of *špṭ* (Isa. 43:26; 66:16; Jer. 2:35; 25:31; Ezk. 17:20; 20:35-36; 38:22; Joel 4:2[3:2]).

The earliest passages that use the vb. *šāpaṭ,* "judge," with Yahweh as subject appear in the appeals of the accuser (Gen. 16:5; Ex. 5:21) and the accused (Jgs. 11:27; 1 S. 24:13[12]). These appeals uses the formula *yišpōṭ yhwh,* "may Yahweh judge." This formula was used in legal proceedings when the plaintiff or the accused saw that their interests were not being protected by humans; they therefore had to rely on the divine judge.

This is also the situation of the psalmists who turn to Yahweh in their distress with the appeal *šopṭēnî,* "give me justice" (Ps. 7:9[8]; 26:1; 35:24; 43:1), or use *šāpaṭ* to express the deliverance Yahweh has granted (Lam. 3:59). According to Isa. 51:5, it is the arms of Yahweh that give the peoples justice.

In his prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 K. 8:32//2 Ch. 6:23), Solomon prays for Yahweh to judge the guilty and the righteous differently. In a similar vein Ps. 75:8(7) describes Yahweh as a judge who puts down one and lifts up another; Ezk. 34:17,22 describes him as the owner of a flock, judging between sheep and goats. Likewise if a treaty is broken, the gods of the parties to the treaty are called on to judge between them (Gen. 31:53).

Several texts show that Yahweh, acting as judge, can also punish. In 1 S. 3:13 *šāpaṭ* in the sense of "punish" has Yahweh as its subject. In Ezk. 11:10-11; 21:35(30); 35:11, *šāpaṭ* refers to Yahweh's act of condemnation; in 5:10,15; 11:9; 16:41; 25:11; 28:22,26; 30:14,19, *'āśâ š^e^pāṭîm* refers to his act of punishment. Finally, 2 Ch. 20:12 prays that Yahweh will punish *(šāpaṭ b^e^)* those who attack Israel.

A distinct complex of texts presents Yahweh as the judge who brings the people's own conduct upon their heads or judges them according to their ways (Ezk. 7:3,8; 18:30; 24:14; 33:20; 36:19). According to Ezk. 7:27, Yahweh judges people according to their own judgments (cf. 16:38). These texts bear witness to the exilic crisis of the wisdom principle that conduct entails commensurate consequences, a principle that no longer operates automatically. Only through Yahweh's act of judgment is punishment inflicted.

Ps. 82:1 transposes Yahweh's judicial role to the heavenly council; here Yahweh enforces his judicial authority over the members of the council by condemning them to annihilation (v. 7) because they did not fulfill their obligation to give justice to human-

---

130. → שׁמשׁ *šemeš;* H.-P. Stähli, *Soläre Elemente im Jahweglauben des AT. OBO* 66 (1985), 30-45; H. Niehr, *Der höchste Gott. BZAW* 190 (1990), 147-63; M. S. Smith, *JBL* 109 (1990) 29-39; P. E. Dion, *ZAW* 103 (1991) 58-65.

ity (vv. 2-5). Possibly Job 21:22 belongs in the same context as Ps. 82. Yahweh's act of *šāpaṭ* with "those on high" as its object may refer to his judgment,[131] but it may also refer more generally to his authority over the heavenly council.[132]

An eschatological judgment by Yahweh appears in various contexts. According to Isa. 2:4 (//Mic. 4:3), when the nations come on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Yahweh will judge between them and determine the truth.[133] Joel 4:12(3:12) locates the eschatological judgment in the "valley of Jehoshaphat," not identifiable geographically. Its symbolic name derives from the act of divine judgment that takes place there; later it was identified with the Kidron Valley.

In contrast to this universal judgment of the nations, the second epilogist of the book of Ecclesiastes sees each individual as subject to Yahweh's judgment.[134] Yahweh brings everyone, righteous or wicked, before his judgment (Eccl. 3:17; cf. 12:12-14).

An eschatological expectation without forensic elements appears in the book of Obadiah. In Ob. 21 those who have been saved will go up to Mt. Zion to rule over Mt. Esau,[135] and the kingdom will belong to Yahweh.

The juridical function of the priesthood represents a distinct element in the complex of motifs associated with Yahweh as judge. This function relates to the administration of oaths (Ex. 22:7[8]), decisions by lot (Ex. 22:8[9]; 28:30; Jgs. 18:5-6; 1 S. 2:25; 23:2; 30:7-8; Prov. 16:33),[136] and decisions by ordeal (Nu. 5:11-31). In addition, priests give rulings in questions of cultic purity and impurity (Lev. 10:9-11; 13:1-59; 14:34-57; Ezk. 22:26; 44:23; Hag. 2:11-14; Ps. 15; 24)[137] and determine the monetary value of human beings, animals, houses, and fields (Lev. 27:1-25). The third area in which priests exercise juridical functions is the court of God in the temple, where a priest dispenses justice in the name of the Deity (Dt. 17:8-13; 21:5; 1 K. 8:31-32; Ps. 3; 4; 5; 7; 11; 17; etc.).

The tendency of the postexilic period to place more emphasis on Yahweh's transcendence led to changes in the complex of motifs associated with Yahweh as judge. Yahweh surrenders the role of prosecutor to a member of the heavenly court.[138] But he also retreats from his role as judge, surrendering it to representatives: the son of man (Dnl. 7:13-14), an angel (10:21; 12:1), or the righteous (7:26-27).

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *špṭ* occurs more than 60 times, mostly in the qal.[139] Forensic usage predominates, with various connotations. The verb may

---

131. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 336, 345.

132. G. Hölscher, *Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 54.

133. → יכח *ykḥ*.

134. D. Michel, *Qohelet. EdF* 258 (1988), 138 n. 14; idem, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet. BZAW* 183 (1989), 248-51.

135. H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 60, 68-70; J. R. Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites. JSOTSup* 77 (1989), 185-86.

136. → גורל *gôrāl;* → כהן *kōhēn* III.2.

137. W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein. SANT* 24 (1970), 44-55; → VII, 67-69; → טהר *ṭāhar;* → טמא *ṭāmē'*.

138. → שׂטן *śāṭān*.

139. Niehr, *Herrschen,* 313 n. 1; also 11QT 51:11.

mean "hold court, act as judge" (1QS 6:24; 8:25; 10:13; CD 10:8,18; 11QT 51:11; 11QPs[a] 24:7), "give justice" (1QS 11:14-15; 1QH 6:9), or "condemn" (1QH 4:18; 5:6; 1QpHab 10:5; 12:5; 4QpIsa[a] 8-10 21). In the nonforensic sense of "rule," *šāpaṭ* appears in 4Q511 10 10.

The niphal is likewise found primarily in its forensic sense of "be condemned" (CD 12:3; 20:10-11,24) or "be judged" (1QH 7:28; 4QpPs37 4:7,9; 4Q159 2-4 4); it can also mean "take to court" (1QH 9:34). Corresponding to the meaning "rule," the niphal can mean "be guided" (1QS 9:10; CD 20:31-32).

The title *šōpēṭ* appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls only in the forensic sense of "judge." In 1QSa 1:15,24,29, as in the OT, the judges are represented as an institution of the tribes of Israel. CD 20:16 expands Hos. 3:4 by adding the term *šōpēṭ.* The occurrences of *šōpᵉṭîm* in CD 9:10; 10:1,4; 14:13; 15:4 refer to a judicial office within the community.

The judges mentioned in 11QT 51:11 and 56:9-10 go back to the laws governing officials in Dt. 16:18 and 17:8-13. 11QT 61:9 is based on Dt. 19:15-21, 11QT 62:4-5 on Dt. 20:1-18.

Niehr

שָׁפַךְ *šāpak;* שֶׁפֶךְ *šepek;* שָׁפְכָה *šopkâ*

I. Distribution, Meaning, Etymology. II. Usage: 1. Cultic and Legal Usage; 2. Human Emotions; 3. God as Subject; 4. Secular Usage. III. Reception: 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. LXX.

I. Distribution, Meaning, Etymology. The root *špk,* found throughout the Semitic language area, denotes the vigorous movement of a solid or liquid. Akkadian texts use *šapāku(m)* to speak of "pouring" water and feed as well as "casting up" military siege ramps.[1] Unlike East Semitic, Northwest Semitic often speaks of "pouring" and particu-

---

šāpak. H. Christ, *Blutvergiessen im AT. Theologische Dissertationen* 12 (Basel, 1977); P. E. Dion, "Early Evidence for the Ritual Significance of the 'Base of the Altar' around Deut 12:27 LXX," *JBL* 106 (1987) 487-90; I. Ephaʿal, "The Assyrian Siege Ramp at Lachish," *TAJ* 11 (1984) 60-69; A. D. Grad, "Studies in Biblical Uses of the Word *Dām*" (diss., Brandeis, 1976); K. Koch, "Der Spruch 'Sein Blut bleibe auf seinem Haupt' und die israelitische Auffassung vom vergossenen Blut," *VT* 12 (1962) 396-416 = *Spuren des hebräischen Denkens. Gesammelte Aufsätze,* I (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991), 128-45; A. Penna, "Il sangue nell' AT," in F. Vattioni, ed., *Sangue e antropologia biblica,* II (Rome, 1981), 379-402; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); J. Wehrle, "Blut," *NBL,* I, 306-8.

1. *AHw,* III, 1168-69; *CAD,* XVII/1, 413-14.

larly of "spilling" blood. The root appears already in Ugaritic[2] in an alphabetic cuneiform incantation.[3] Later it is found in South Semitic in Arab. *safaka*.[4] There may be a connection with Arab. *sabaka* in the sense of "melt and pour into a mold,"[5] also with metathesis *sakaba*, "pour" fluid or metal.[6] This verb appears also in Ethiopic, in the form of Old Eth. *sabaka*.[7]

The Aramaic evidence is similar. The vb. *šᵉpak̠* in Jewish Aramaic[8] and in Syriac[9] means "pour" or "spill." In Mandaic, *špk* has the weakened sense of "drip in."[10] Only in Rabbinic Hebrew[11] do we find as broad a range of what can be poured, spilled, and heaped up as in Biblical Hebrew.[12]

Because no text speaks of pouring a liquid from a vessel, Heb. *špk* should not be considered a causative shaphel form of *hpk*, as though a jug were "overturned" and its contents "poured out."[13] Many passages suggest not "a sprinkling from a watering can but a torrential flood."[14] It is therefore preferable to think in terms of a biliteral root *(šp)* and its associated semantic category,[15] connoting a continuous, dense movement upward or downward: besides *špk*, cf. *šp'* and *špḥ*, as well as *šṭp* and *šṣp*, along with Jewish Aram. *šᵉpā'* and Middle Heb. *šāpâ*.[16] This base (cf. also Egyp. *šp*, "flow out, perish"[17]) would be differentiated and made semantically more precise by the addition of a third consonant.

The root *špk* appears 115 times as a verb, primarily in the qal, and 3 times as a noun.[18] Almost half the occurrences of the verb are associated with the noun *dām*. Other groups of nouns that appear frequently as the object of *špk* are *ḥēmâ* and *za'am*, as well as *mayim*, *sôlᵉlâ*, and *rûaḥ*. There are several verbs in the semantic field of *špk* that overlap in usage but nevertheless have their own particular nuances.[19]

---

2. *UT*, no. 2464; *WUS*, no. 2665.

3. *KTU* 1.18, IV, 23-24, 34-35 (restored); possibly also *KTU* 1.82, 16 (see J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *UF* 16 [1984] 243).

4. Wehr, 413: *safk ad-dimā'*, "bloodshed."

5. Wehr, 396.

6. Wehr, 416.

7. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 483-84.

8. *WTM*, IV, 596; also in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Beyer, 717.

9. *LexSyr*, 795.

10. *MdD*, 472.

11. Jastrow, 1616-17.

12. See II below.

13. C. J. Labuschagne, "Original Shaph'el-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OT Studies. OTWSA* 10 (1971), 59; cf. already Jastrow, 1616.

14. K. Koch, *ZAW* 86 (1974) 518.

15. S. Moscati et al., *Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (1964), 71-75; → שׁטף *šṭp*.

16. *WTM*, IV, 594-95.

17. *WbÄS*, IV, 443-44.

18. For its distribution by verbal stem and biblical books, see F. I. Andersen and A. D. Forbes, *The Vocabulary of the OT* (Rome, 1989), passim.

19. → יצק *yāṣaq*.

II. Usage.

1. *Cultic and Legal Usage.* Together with other verbs, *špk* fulfills a ritual function in various blood rituals. In contrast to the religious practices of other cultures in antiquity,[20] no beneficent or sacramental use of blood was open to the ancient Israelites. They were forbidden to consume blood in any form (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 3:17; 7:26; 17:10-14; 19:26; Dt. 12:16,23; 15:23), for blood is closely bound up with life (*bᵉnapšô dāmô*, Gen. 9:4; reverse order in Lev. 17:11) or even identified with life (*haddām hû' hannepeš*, Dt. 12:23). Therefore the consumption of blood is tantamount to the shedding of blood (Gen. 9:4-6; Lev. 7:26-27; cf. also Ezk. 33:25; and 1 S. 14:32-35: "eating with the blood"). Because of this blood taboo, animals must be ritually slaughtered in a special way (cf. Ger. *schächten*). The blood of the slaughtered animal is to be poured out *(špk)* on the ground "like water" (Dt. 12:16,24) and covered with earth (*'āpār*, Lev. 17:13). This practice presupposes the secular slaughtering of animals in the local community following the centralization of the cult; it also applies to the slaughtering of defective animals unfit for sacrifice (Dt. 15:23). In consequence of the connection between blood and life, it also retained its significance in the narrower context of sacrificial theology.

Within the complex OT sacrificial system, the vb. *špk* appears in the "law of the sin offering," i.e., the *ḥaṭṭā't*[21] ritual in Lev. 4, where the blood is used in two different ways,[22] in each case to "make atonement" for unintentional sins. After a series of applications of blood, the priest pours out *(špk)* the remaining blood at the base[23] of the burnt offering. (The same ceremony is used at the investiture of Aaron in Ex. 29:12; the parallel account in Lev. 8:15, which is clearly traditio-historically earlier, uses *yṣq* instead of *špk*.[24]) The blood is poured into a gutter (Ezk. 43:13)[25] and thus protected from profanation; not until the immediate effectiveness of the blood is thus totally and completely removed is the ritual complete (cf. Sir. 50:15-16).

It is uncertain whether the blood of the *zebaḥ* offering[26] (Dt. 12:27, qal passive of *špk*) has ritual significance. In particular, the meaning of *'al-mizbaḥ* is unclear. If the blood is poured on or beside the altar along with the meat, there is no chance of profanation;[27] or does "even secular slaughtering have confessional character?"[28]

More clearly, a different *špk* action (Lev. 4:12), not described in all sections of the *ḥaṭṭā't* ritual, stands outside the sacrifice itself. The portions of the animal not needed for the sacrificial act are to be taken to a special place, called *šepek̲ haddešen*, where they are burned. The condition that this must be a "clean place" *(māqôm ṭāhôr)*, however, keeps

20. See J. H. Waszink, *RAC*, II, 459-69.

21. → חטא *ḥāṭā'*.

22. B. Janowski, *Suhn als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 222-34; cf. N. Kiuchi, *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature. JSOTSup* 56 (1987), 119-30, 143-59.

23. → יסד *yāsad̲*.

24. Janowski, 233.

25. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 423, 425-26.

26. → זבח *zābaḥ*.

27. Rendtorff, 146: "beside."

28. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium I. NEB* (1986), 100; cf. EÜ: "on."

The scene presented in 1 S. 7:6 is unique. In the setting of a communal fast the Israelites gather at Mizpah to offer sacrifice, but also draw *(š'b)* water and then pour it out before Yahweh (*lipnê yhwh;* cf. 2 S. 23:16-17). The significance of the water ritual is hard to determine. We may leave open the question whether the text describes a libation ritual or mourning ceremony, or — more likely — a penitential ceremony for the removal of sin.[44]

Sacrificial regulations can also speak of bloodguilt and thus establish a relationship to the shedding of blood and the theological and legal provisions governing it. According to Lev. 17:3-4, whoever slaughters an animal without presenting it as an offering is "held guilty of bloodshed" *(dām yēḥāšēb̲ lāʾîš).*

Only once (1 K. 18:28) is blood the subject of *špk:* blood flows when the prophets of Baal cut themselves in ritual combat, probably borrowed from Syrian models.[45] Everywhere else, *špk* is used transitively with blood as its object. Shedding blood is "not a neutral term for 'killing,' but implies a judgment on the act: the killing is intentional and therefore — with the exception of revenge — culpable."[46]

There is no semantic distinction between the singular and plural forms of *dām.*[47] Of the more than 30 passages that deal with the shedding of blood, only 2 (1 K. 2:31; 1 Ch. 28:3; cf. 1 Ch. 22:8) use the plural. A distinction between blood shed by violence *(dāmîm)* and the blood circulating in an unscathed individual *(dām)* is out of the question. It is more likely that the plural is used intensively or affectively[48] to express the culpability of the act (e.g., Dt. 19:10).[49]

"When blood is shed, it creates a 'sphere of blood' that envelopes the author of the deed"[50] and pollutes *(ḥnp)* the entire land (Nu. 35:33). Thus the command in Nu. 35:33-34 not to pollute and defile (*ṭmʾ* piel) the land, based on the law of talion (Ex. 21:12), is theologically motivated: violation of the land introduces a mortal peril into the created order; expiation *(kpr)* for the blood that is shed (*špk* qal pass.) requires the blood of the one who shed it. The question of the inviolability of human life that arises from this principle finds its most compact expression, both legally and theologically, in the fact that human beings are made in God's image (Gen. 9:6). The right of *talion* in the case of a violent death is a vital obligation grounded in the order of creation.

In case the identity of a murderer remains unknown, a ritual is provided to remove the bloodguilt that cannot be pursued subjectively but nevertheless burdens the land objectively. The elders and priests who live near the scene of the crime are to wash their hands over a heifer whose neck has been broken (Dt. 21:6) and declare their inno-

---

44. T. Podella, *Ṣôm-Fasten. AOAT* 224 (1989), 170 n. 27, following H. J. Stoebe, *Erste Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 168.

45. E. Würthwein, *Könige II: 1.Kön. 17–2.Kön. 25. ATD* 11/2 (1984), 219-20: a post-Dtr addition.

46. Christ, 18.

47. Contra Koch, 405-6.

48. → דם *dām.*

49. Christ, 44, 63-65.

50. Koch, 405.

namic verbs (*ṣlḥ*, Jgs. 14:6,19; 15:14; etc.; *hyh ʿal*, Nu. 24:2; Jgs. 3:10; etc.; *lbš*, e.g., Jgs. 6:34; *pʿm*, Jgs. 13:25).

The prophetic use of metaphor repeatedly produces semantically astonishing formulations. In the context of God's anger, this holds true particularly for the use of → חמה *ḥēmâ*. Its etymological connection with "be hot" leads naturally to a corresponding construction (*yṣt*, "be kindled," 2 K. 22:13,17; *bʿr*, "burn," Jer. 7:20; Ps. 89:47[46]; Est. 1:12), but this relationship can also be subverted. Then, instead of blazing like fire (Jer. 4:4; 21:12; Nah. 1:6; cf. also Isa. 9:18[19]; Zeph. 1:18), God's "burning" wrath is poured out like water (Jer. 6:11; Ezk. 7:8; 14:19; 20:8; Ps. 79:6; with *ntk* qal: Jer. 42:18; 44:6; etc.; niphal: Jer. 7:20; 42:18; etc.; cf. also the image of the cup of wrath: Isa. 51:17,22; Jer. 25:15). In a paradoxical reversal, it can also be poured out like fire (*špk kāʾēš ḥᵃmāṯô*, Lam. 2:4; cf. also Isa. 42:25; Ezk. 22:22; 30:14-16; Ps. 79:5-6).

Very rarely, it is foreign nations on whom Yahweh's *ḥēmâ* is poured (Jer. 10:25 = Ps. 79:6-7; Ezk. 30:15, on Egypt; Sir. 36[33]:8, universally). Primarily, however, it is directed against Israel, whose wickedness Yahweh pours back as disaster (*špk* with *rāʿâ*), an example of the actions-consequences nexus.

The book of Ezekiel speaks most frequently of the outpouring of *ḥēmâ*, adding that this wrath achieves its goal of destruction (*klh* piel, Ezk. 7:8; 20:13,21).[72] Blood can be contrastively both the result (14:19) and the cause (36:18) of an outpouring of wrath.

Besides *ḥēmâ*, two other terms for "wrath" appear with *špk* (once each): *ḥārôn* (in the syntagm *ḥᵃrôn ʾappô*, with *ʾēš*) as God's judgment on the whole population (Lam. 4:11), and *ʿeḇrâ*, which will be poured out (like water) on the high officials of Judah (Hos. 5:10).

Finally, the lexical field of God's anger includes the segholate → זעם *zaʿam*, which appears in parallelisms in Zeph. 3:8 (*ḥᵃrôn ʾappî* and *ʾēš qinʾāṯî*), Ezk. 21:36[35]; 22:31 (*bᵉʾēš ʿeḇrāṯî;* without *zaʿam* in Isa. 38:19; Ezk. 22:21), and Ps. 69:25(24) (*ḥᵃrôn ʾappᵉḵā*).

Here too the language is unexpected and metaphorical — note the contradictory sequence of events in Ps. 69:25(24): first indignation is heaped on the enemy, then they are pursued and overtaken (*nśg* hiphil). Here too there is a congruence between actions and consequences: the wickedness of the guilty brings disaster on their own heads (*darkām bᵉrōʾšām*, Ezk. 22:31; cf. Ps. 69:22-23[21-22]; see also the discussion of Jer. 14:16 above).

Wrath deprives people of the very basis of their lives when Yahweh pours *bûz* on them. In Ps. 107:40 and Job 12:21, "contempt" is heaped on the *nᵉḏîḇîm*, who as a rule enjoy particular respect.[73]

With God as subject only rarely is *špk* used of liquids. In two of the three hymnic texts in the book of Amos, a passage in participial style praises Yahweh's transforming creative power: in particular, he "collects"[74] the waters of the sea and then pours them

72. → כלה *kālâ*.
73. → נדב *ndb*.
74. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 241.

(back) over the earth (Am. 5:8; 9:6). In Sir. 43:19 God the creator pours out frost like salt (*yskwn* in the Sirach scroll from Masada[75]).

4. *Secular Usage.* In the secular realm the number of things that human beings pour out is remarkably small. When Moses hesitates in the face of God's call, God enables him to perform the miracle of pouring water on the ground, where it turns into blood (Ex. 4:9). Except in this passage, the OT never uses *špk* for the pouring of a liquid outside the cult.

In Ps. 73:2, where the psalmist's steps are "buried," the ambiguity of metaphorical language prohibits us from saying precisely whether *šuppᵉk̲uh (Q) ʾᵃšurāy* refers to a stumble or to a fall.[76] The reflection in Lam. 4:1, in the style of a dirge, unmistakably voices the attempt of people to cope with the breakdown following the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem: the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the "children of Zion" (v. 2), are like precious stones (*ʾab̲nê-qōd̲eš*[77]) scattered in the filth of the streets. The city's inhabitants, its pride and glory, are destroyed.

Surprisingly, the vb. *špk* appears in realms of life where it would not be expected. In Sir. 20:13 the windy courtesies of fools are discountenanced as pointless *(wṭwbt ksylym yšpwk),* as is the attempt to pour truly good food into a closed mouth (*ṭwbh špwkh ʿl ph stwm,* 30:18). Sirach likewise uses *špk* to radicalize the opposite phenomenon, inordinate greed for all kinds of delicacies (*ʾl tšpk ʿl kl mṭʿmym,* 37:29). Knowing realistically that there is a proper time for everything, the sage in Sir. 32(35):4 urges guests at a drinking party *(bmqwm hyyn)* not to pour out their thoughts *(ʾl tšpk śyḥ)* but to sing.

The occurrences of *špk* with solid materials are concentrated in military contexts, where during an attack on a city (mentioned explicitly in Dnl. 11:15) siege works are "cast up" *(špk* with *sōlᵉlâ).* The description in 2 S. 20:15 shows that, besides trying to undermine the city wall, the attackers cast up an earthen structure up to the outworks ([*wattaʿᵃmōd̲*] *baḥēl*[78]) of the city *(ʾel-hāʿîr)* under attack. This description does not refer to a rampart surrounding the city,[79] but rather a siege ramp of terre pisée, sometimes reinforced with wood (2 K. 19:32 = Isa. 37:33; Jer. 6:6; Ezk. 4:2; 26:8).[80] In addition to the ramp, on which battering rams (*kārîm,* Ezk. 4:2; 21:27[22]) were directed against the wall, a siege wall (*dāyēq,* 4:2; 17:17; 21:27[22]; 26:8) was built to encircle the city (*māṣôr,* 4:2; cf. also *dāyēq sāb̲îb̲,* 2 K. 25:1 = Jer. 52:4).

Both measures, still in use at Masada in the Roman period,[81] were practiced systematically by the Assyrians. In the period of Esarhaddon, Akk. *dayyiqu* denotes a siege embankment or siege wall;[82] the expression *špk sōlᵉlâ* embraces two Akkadian expres-

75. G. Sauer, "Jesus Sirach," *JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 613.
76. For other possible interpretations see *HAL,* II, 1630.
77. J. A. Emerton, *ZAW* 79 (1967) 233-36.
78. *HAL,* I, 312.
79. As suggested by *GesB,* 545, and EÜ, alternating with "embankment."
80. → סלל *sālal.*
81. See, e.g., H. Weippert, *BRL²*, 41-42.
82. *AHw,* I, 151.

sions used in this context: *špk* corresponds to *ep(i)ri šapāku,* "cast up earth" (a *šāpikum* may be an "embankment builder"[83]); *sōlᵉlâ* is the result of *arammu šukbusu,* "construct a ramp by stamping (earth)." The two expressions in combination appear in a literary text of Esarhaddon.[84]

III. Reception. 1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Usage in the Dead Sea Scrolls basically coincides with the OT spectrum, but goes beyond it in certain details. The scrolls speak repeatedly of shedding blood (1QM 6:17; 4QMᵃ 1:14–15:9; 1QH 2:33; CD 12:6 par.; 4Q379 22 22:13 [restored[85]]; 4Q504 8 14; 4Q525 13 3) and also of the pouring of blood on the ground in a sacrificial context (1Q22 4 2 [bis; restored][86]). Here belong the occurrences in the Temple Scroll (11QT 52:12; 53:5; 63:6, with parallels in Deuteronomy). 11QT 16:3 speaks of a ritual connected with the festival of dedication, during which blood is poured on the four corners of the altar. And 32:14 describes a structure near the temple through which water mixed with the blood of the sacrificial animals can flow and then seep into the ground.

The dietary laws expect a fish to be cut up alive so that its blood can be poured off (*wnš*[*p*]*k* [*dm*]*m,* CD 12:13-14).[87]

The OT notion that God's wrath is poured out over people, specifically the *śārê yᵉhûḏâ,* also appears in the scrolls, with *ʿeḇrâ* in CD 8:3 and 19:16 (*km*[*ym*], "like water") and with *ḥēmâ* in 4QDibHamᵃ 1-2 3:10; 5:4 (in each case together with *ḥārôn, ʾap̱,* and *qinʾâ* [restored in 3:10]) and 6Q10 1 2:4. For "pouring out a lament to God," see 4Q509 1+2 1:4; 4Q525 14 2:23. A parenetic text uses *špk* in a positive sense in the context of creation theology: to care for humankind, Yahweh rains food *(ʾkl)* on the mountaintops (4Q370 1:1 [restored[88]]).

2. *LXX.* The LXX offers few surprises. As a rule it uses the vb. *ekcheín* for *špk.* Once (1 K. 18:28) it uses the noun form *ékchysis* for the infinitive of *špk;* it uses the same word for the noun *šep̱ek̲* (Lev. 4:12). For the pouring out of blood in the *zeḇaḥ* offering in Dt. 12:27, we find *proscheín* in combination with *prós tḗn básin toú thysiastēríou,* representing MT *ʿal-mizbaḥ yhwh.*[89]

In Isa. 42:25, in the semantic field of "wrath," the translation *epágein* is a unique divergence from the normal *ekcheín.* Most of the divergent translations appear in texts that speak of casting up a rampart. In contrast to the original meaning,[90] we find words that indicate a circular shape (*peribállein,* Ezk. 4:2; *kykloún,* Isa. 37:33 — both times a

83. *AHw,* III, 1172.

84. Ephʿal, 64.

85. C. Newsom, *JJS* 39 (1988) 68-71.

86. J. T. Milik, *DJD,* I (1955), 95-96.

87. On the discussion in early Judaism see C. Rabin, *Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, ²1958), 62.

88. C. A. Newsom, *RevQ* 13 (1988) 31-32.

89. See Dion.

90. See II.4 above.

structure on pilings) or a palisade (*bállein* with *chṓma*, Ezk. 21:27[22]; *charakobolía*, Ezk. 17:17). The "casting up" in Dnl. 11:15 is represented not by a real equivalent but by the very general term *epistréphein* with *dóry*. For *šop̱kâ* in Dt. 23:2(1), the LXX uses *apokekomménos* ("mutilated"), which it interprets by adding *thladiás* ("eunuch"; cf. Vg.: *de scorto natus*, "born of a prostitute"; MT: *pᵉṣûaʿ-dakkāʾ*).[91]

Liwak

91. See II.1 above.

שָׁפֵל *šāp̱ēl*; שָׁפָל *šāp̱āl*; שְׁפֵלָה *šᵉp̱ēlâ*

I. Etymology. II. Statistics. III. Usage: 1. Leviticus; 2. Self-Abasement; 3. Humiliation by God; 4. Geographical Region. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls. VI. Summary.

I. Etymology. The root *špl* appears in all Semitic languages except Ethiopic;[1] its basic meaning is "be low," in the causative stems "make low." In Hebrew the verb refers primarily to humiliation by God; the emphasis varies greatly in the other dialects. In

šāpēl. G. Bertram, "'Hochmut' und verwandte Begriffe im griechischen und hebräischen AT," *WO* 3 (1964) 32-43; K. Engelken, *Frauen im Alten Israel. BWANT* 130 (1990); O. Garcia de la Fuente, "Sobre la idea de contrición en el AT," *Sacra pagina*, I. *BETL* 12 (1959), 559-79; W. Grundmann, "ταπεινός," *TDNT*, VIII, 1-26; H.-J. Hermisson, "Jeremias Wort über Jojachin," in R. Albertz et al., eds., *Werden und Wirken des AT. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 252-70, esp. 266-68; E. Kutsch, "Demut II. Biblisch," *RGG*³, II, 77-78; R. Martin-Achard, "ענה *ʿnh* II to be destitute," *TLOT*, II, 931-37; G. Mensching, "Demut I. Religionsgeschichtlich," *RGG*³, 76-77; H. D. Preuss, "Demut I. AT," *TRE*, VIII, 459-61; T. Seidl, "Aussatz," *NBL*, I, 218-19; H.-P. Stähli, "גאה *gʾh* to be high," *TLOT*, I, 285-87.

III.4: Y. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, ²1979), esp. 25-26, 41-42; H. Brodsky, "The Shephelah," *BRev* 3 (1987) 48-52; O. Eissfeldt and A. Kuschke, "Kanaan I. Geographisch," *RGG*³, III, 1106-8; I. Finkelstein, "The *šĕpēlâ* of Israel," *BethM* 25 (1979/80) 341-45; idem, "The Shephelah of Israel," *Tel Aviv* 8 (1981) 84-94; G. Galil, "The Administrative Division of the Shephelah," *Shnaton* 9 (1985) 55-71; L. Krinetzki, "'Tal' und 'Ebene' im AT," *BZ* 5 (1961) 204-20; A. F. Rainey, "The Biblical Shephelah of Judah," *BASOR* 251 (1983) 1-22; B. Z. Rosenfeld, "The Borders of the Shephelah from the Biblical to the Rabbinic Period," *BethM* 29 (1983/84) 367-76.

→ גאה *gʾh*, דכא *dāḵāʾ*, קלל *qll*.

1. *HAL*, II, 1631-32.

Akkadian (*šapālu*[*m*]), canals, cisterns, ditches, the moon, stars, water, eyes, parts of the body, and grades of service can be "low" or "deep"; ground water, constellations, parts of the body, etc., can be "made deep" or "made low." The verb may also convey the connotations of "humiliate" or "abase oneself."[2] The lexical field in Aramaic *(šᵉpal, šᵉpēl, šaplā', šaplūṯā')* corresponds quite precisely to that in Hebrew.[3] The situation in Syriac is very similar.[4] Ugar. *špl* appears in just one poetic text,[5] which Whitley[6] compares to Eccl. 10:6, since both texts employ the antithesis "high — low." Arab. *safala/safila* stands for "be low, be below something, turn downward, be low, base, despicable, abase oneself, sink low, go from bad to worse, act in a base manner"; it also has several derivatives.[7] There is no etymologically related root in Egyptian; the words closest in meaning to "lower" are *śyd*,[8] *ḳb*,[9] and *dḥ*.[10]

II. Statistics. There are 69 occurrences of the base *špl* and all its derivatives in the OT, distributed quite evenly among the different word classes. The verb is used most often (28 times), 10 times in the qal and 18 in the hiphil. The other stems are not attested in Hebrew, so that the meaning envisaged is either the state of being low or the action of making low. The former is also expressed 18 times by the adj. *šāpāl*. Of the nominal formations, *šᵉpēlâ* is clearly the most common (19 times); it denotes a low-lying geographical region. The nouns *šēpel*[11] and *šiplâ* ("low condition") together occur only 3 times,[12] and *šiplûṯ* in the sense of "carelessness" occurs only once (Eccl. 10:18).[13]

Almost half of the 69 occurrences are in the prophets: 33 instances, concentrated in Isaiah (19). The other half are divided about equally between cultic and sapiential poetry (16) and DtrH (13). The root plays only a minor role in the Pentateuch and ChrH. The distribution in detail: 4 times in Leviticus, 1 in Deuteronomy, 7 in Joshua, 1 in Judges, 1 in 1 Samuel, 2 in 2 Samuel, 1 in 1 Kings, 19 in Isaiah, 4 in Jeremiah, 7 in Ezekiel, 1 each in Malachi, Obadiah, and Zechariah, 6 in Psalms, 3 in Job, 4 in Proverbs, 3 in Ecclesiastes, 1 in 1 Chronicles, and 2 in 2 Chronicles.

III. Usage. In the case of the occurrences of the root in Leviticus (see 1 below) and the geographical term (4 below), the basic meaning ("be low") is readily apparent. Al-

---

2. *AHw*, III, 1169-70; *CAD*, XVII/1, 422-27.
3. *ANH*³, 432; *DISO*, 317.
4. *LexSyr*, 795-96.
5. *KTU* 1.23, 32, first published by C. Virolleaud, *Syr* 14 (1933) 128-51; cf. *WUS*, no. 2666; *UT*, no. 2465.
6. C. F. Whitley, *UF* 11 (1979) 819.
7. Wehr, 413.
8. *WbÄS*, IV, 41.
9. *WbÄS* V, 22.
10. *WbÄS*, V, 480.
11. Michel, 67.
12. Mandelkern, 1228.
13. H. W. Hertzberg, *Prediger*. *KAT* XVII/4 (1963), 197.

most two-thirds of the occurrences, however, have to do with God's humiliation of human beings (3 below) or appear in texts, mostly sapiential, that are concerned to demonstrate the desirability of human self-abasement (2 below).

1. *Leviticus.* Chs. 13 and 14 of the Levitical law of purity describe the symptoms of various skin diseases and lay out instructions for the priests, who as interpreters of the law — but using medical analysis — must decide whether the victims are clean or unclean.[14] Besides changes in the hair and skin color of the diseased area, the symptoms include a depression in or of the skin, denoted either by *špl* (Lev. 13:20-21,26) or *'mq* (13:3-4,25,30-32,34);[15] cf. also the "leprosy" on the wall of a house that is "deeper" than the surface (14:37). That *špl* and *'mq* are used synonymously is shown by 13:25-26, where *'mq* describes an acute disease (v. 25), while *špl* describes the opposite, a phase of the disease that may well heal (v. 26). All the other passages that exhibit the same structure use either *'mq* or *špl* for both cases. (It is hard to tell whether the use of these two terms to describe geographical features as well is simply accidental.) Although this material is presented as part of the Priestly corpus, the "disease *tôrâ*" most likely reflects preexilic notions and truly archaic rituals.[16]

2. *Self-Abasement.* The following texts are based on the familiar principle "those who humble themselves will be exalted"; they belong accordingly to the large group of maxims formulated against the background of the "act-consequence relationship."[17] Prov. 16:19 states that it is better to belong to the class of the *'ᵃnāwîm* than that of the *gē'îm*. If we take the root *g'h* here in its negative figurative sense[18] and translate *gē'îm* as the "proud and arrogant," then it is reasonable to see in the *'ᵃnāwîm* those with the opposite attitude, the "humble and lowly." Whether we adopt the reading of *K* or *Q*[19] — the differences between *'ānāw* and *'ānî* are slight — the maxim conveys a further distinct sense if we read it as contrasting victors and vanquished (prisoners?), especially since the former are described as dividing the spoil (v. 19b), which in itself is not a reprehensible action. Nevertheless, this is a question of perspective: if the vanquished have the correct (better) attitude of mind, i.e., if they are "of a lowly spirit" (*šᵉpal-rûaḥ*, v. 19a), then it is better (yet) to belong to them than to the victors. In this manner mental attitude ("lowly spirit") takes precedence over social position (taking part in military expeditions and dividing the spoil).

This shift of values can happen quite easily, because behind it stands the notion that those of "lowly spirit" will ultimately find honor and glory (*kāḇôḏ*, Prov. 29:23b), whereas pride and arrogance *(gaʾᵃwaṯ)* bring humiliation (29:23a). Thus the proper at-

---

14. R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, 462-63; Seidl.

15. → עמק *'ēmeq.*

16. De Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, 460-64; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 178.

17. G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1972), 128-33.

18. *HAL,* I, 168; Stähli, 381; D. Kellermann, → II, 349-50.

19. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 194; A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), II, 272.

titude will result in a fitting social position. Prov. 25:6-7 makes the same point, although this text specifically envisages conduct at court in the presence of the king. Refusal to claim high position protects against public humiliation *(špl)*. In the ironic vision of Ecclesiastes, this order is turned on its head (Eccl. 10:6): fools are set in high places, the rich sit *bᵉšēp̱el*, "in a low place."

A unique instance of self-abasement appears in 2 S. 6, where David is described as dancing — probably naked — during the return of the ark to Jerusalem. Stolz[20] assumes a cultic dance like that attested among Israel's neighbors; over the course of time such dancing was excluded from Yahwism.[21] In this narrative only David's wife Michal takes offense at the king's behavior (v. 20); David, however, interprets his dancing before Yahweh as an act of self-abasement, which ultimately brings him honor *(kāḇēḏ)* even among the underlings (vv. 21-22). This self-abasement is denoted by both *špl* and *qll*, "be small, light, slight."[22]

3. *Humiliation by God.* The texts just discussed presuppose implicitly that God is the guarantor of proper order; we now turn to texts that speak of God explicitly as humbling people.

a. The realm of the act-consequence relationship includes all the texts that describe God as both humbling and exalting people, often with a reversal of fortunes. God's actions can affect symbolically anything high and anything low — mountains and valleys, trees great and small (Isa. 10:33; 40:4; Ezk. 17:24; 21:31). More often, however, human beings are the object of God's actions. Once we find "poor" and "rich" in parallel with "bring low" and "exalt" (1 S. 2:7). Even here, however, the primary focus is on the contrast between "humble/poor" *('ānāw/'ānî)* and "proud/arrogant/wicked" *(rwm/ rš')*. This contrast can involve the whole nation as well as individuals (2 S. 22:28; Ps. 18:28[Eng. 27]; 147:6; cf. also 75:8[7]; 138:6).

b. Proto-Isaiah in particular incorporates the motif of humbling the proud as an element of Yahweh's judgment, which may affect humankind in general (*'îš* and *'āḏām*, Isa. 2:9,11-12,17; 5:15) or the wicked in particular (*rᵉšā'îm*, 13:11) as well as the enemies of Israel (Moab, 25:11-12; an unidentified enemy city, 26:5-6; cf. also 32:19). Only once does Isaiah speak of humbling Jerusalem, so that the city is forced to speak from the dust like a ghost (29:4). Although the prophets frequently use the image of a violated woman for a city threatened by God's judgment (esp. Zion/Jerusalem),[23] this aspect (often with sexual overtones) does not appear to play any role in the use of *špl* (e.g., the term for rape is → ענה *'nh* II). Isaiah uses the root → שׁחח *šḥḥ* (2:9,11,17; 5:15; 25:12; 26:5) alongside *špl* and clearly with the same meaning, a usage that has led Wildberger and others to speak of a "refrain" that Isaiah has borrowed from wisdom.[24]

---

20. F. Stolz, *Samuel. ZBK* 9 (1981), 217-18.
21. See also Engelken, 141-42.
22. J. Scharbert, → XIII, 38: "the qal is used in semantic antithesis to *kāḇēḏ*."
23. Engelken, 11-13.
24. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 102.

c. In Ezekiel *špl* denotes the loss of political autarchy, a situation in which the total breakdown of the state is not yet implicit. Zedekiah in relation to Babylonia (Ezk. 17:14; cf. also v. 6) and Egypt in relation to the rest of the world (29:14-15) are left with only a "humble kingdom." For Jehoiachin and his mother, the command to take a lowly seat spells the end of their rule (Jer. 13:18), just as the humiliation of the corrupt generation of priests means removal from office (Mal. 2:9).

d. Surprisingly few texts reflect God's deliverance from a state of abasement denoted by *špl.* One example is Ps. 136:23, which, in a retrospective summary of sacred history, states categorically: "He remembered us in our low estate, for his steadfast love endures forever." Since the next verse addresses rescue from foes, the "low estate" here can be interpreted as political oppression. That God dwells on high but looks far down *(hammašpîlî lir'ôṯ)* is a fundamental element of his engagement on behalf of the poor and needy (Ps. 113:4-9). A salvation oracle in Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 57:13b-19)[25] addresses (v. 5) those who are "humble in spirit" *(šᵉpal-rûaḥ)* and "contrite in heart" *(lēḇ niḏkā'îm),* expressions that describe a "remoteness from God and abandonment by him at the deepest level. He recognizes that the reason for this is sin, his sins against God and man." This usage is specific to the "theological reflection of exilic and postexilic prophecy, especially in Trito-Isaiah."[26]

When Job finds himself in such a situation, his friend Eliphaz urges him to turn to God, because God sets on high those who are lowly and comforts those who mourn (Job 5:11; cf. 22:29, where the text is very corrupt and is not represented in the LXX[27]); again, this advice represents common tradition. When commanded by God, Job cannot himself produce such a world order as this tradition reflects (40:11).

e. In Ecclesiastes' allegory of old age (Eccl. 12:4a), *špl* is used in a figurative sense not found elsewhere. As an image of the fragility of old age, which the reader is to visualize so as to enjoy youth to its fullest, Ecclesiastes describes "doors on the street that are shut, while the sound of the grinding is low." This image is probably meant to suggest that the voice grows soft or weak with age[28] or that it may become increasingly difficult to hear.[29]

4. *Geographical Region.* A varied group of summaries, mostly from a Dtr pen and dealing with military campaigns, mention several geographical regions: the hill country, the Mediterranean coast, the slopes, the Arabah, the desert, the Negeb — and also a region called the *šᵉp̄ēlâ,* a zone of Eocene limestone hills extending from the southern coastal plain to the mountains of Judah (Dt. 1:7; Josh. 9:1; 10:40; 11:2,16; 12:8; 15:33; Jgs. 1:9; 2 Ch. 26:10; 28:18).[30] The geographical groupings in Jer. 17:26; 32:44; 33:13;

---

25. As delimited by K. Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch. WMANT* 62 (1990), 46.

26. H. F. Fuhs, → III, 207; Koenen (188; cf. also 57) points out that "there are only four other OT texts where רוח appears as a *nomen rectum* in combination with an afflicted individual."

27. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 352, 361, with a proposed emendation.

28. Hertzberg, *Prediger,* 212.

29. A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 212.

30. Aharoni, 25-26, 41-42.

mility" with the Greco-Roman and Christian virtue of humility as presented in Mt. 18:3-4. The OT lexical field associated with "humble" (*'nh* II and its derivatives, *kn'*, *dl, špl)* has generally negative connotations (poor, lowly, wretched, oppressed, exploited, etc.). When self-abasement is thematized in wisdom literature, the ultimate purpose is to counsel modes of conduct that will bring profit and success, on the principle that good is rewarded, evil avenged. In any given situation, accommodation to this established (divine) order may — but not necessarily must — require self-abasement. In the OT, in contrast to the extrabiblical material, the focus shifts to God as the active subject who brings low and humiliates. This change is probably due to the strong personal ties linking Israel to Yahweh, the one God, who not only serves as guarantor of the divine order but also intervenes and more specifically punishes in particular cases.

Engelken

שָׁקַד *šāqad;* שְׁקִידָה *š^eqîdâ;* שָׁקֵד *šāqēd;* מְשֻׁקָּד *m^ešuqqād*

I. Root and Etymology: 1. Verb; 2. Almond. II. Usage.

I. Root and Etymology. The Hebrew root *šqd* covers two distinct semantic domains: the vb. *šāqad* < *ṯqd* with the basic meaning "watch, take care (of)," and the botanical term *šāqēd,* denoting the almond tree and its fruit. Although the almond originated in the Near East, it is not entirely certain that there is an etymological connection between the verbal root and the botanical term, despite the popular etymology *virga vigilans* of the Vg. in Jer. 1:11. If there is such a connection, it may originate in the "guardian" role played by the shell of the almond, manifested best toward the end of the ripening process, when the protective shell finally opens and releases the mature fruit. Of course this derivation is speculative.

1. *Verb.* The verbal root *ṯqd* > *šqd* is found only in Northwest Semitic: Amorite, Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Phoenician-Punic. The name *ia-aš-qí-id*-DINGIR, "God/El

---

šāqad. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 363; J. Feliks, "Mandelbaum," *BHHW,* II, 1139; E. Lipiński, "Acte de vente immobilière de Milkyaton, fils d'Abd-El-Shoqéd (668 av. J.-C.)," *Sem* 39 (1990) 23-27; G. Sauer, "Mandelzweig und Kessel in Jer 1,11ff.," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 56-61; W. Thiel, "'Vom Norden her wird das Unheil eröffnet,'" in V. Fritz et al., eds., *Prophet und Prophetenbuch. FS O. Kaiser. BZAW* 185 (1989), 231-45; K. van der Toorn, "Did Jeremiah See Aaron's Staff?" *JSOT* 43 (1989) 83-94; W. G. Williams, "Jeremiah's Vision of the Almond Rod," in E. C. Hobbs, ed., *Stubborn Faith. FS W. A. Irwin* (Dallas, 1956), 90-99; P. S. Wood, "Jeremiah's Figure of the Almond Rod," *JBL* 61 (1942) 99-103; M. Zohary, "שָׁקֵד," *EMiqr,* VIII, 254-55.

watched over," is attested at Dilbat in Babylonia in the 19th century B.C.E.;[1] in the 18th century it was borne by Haneans at Mari.[2] A Sutean with the patronymic *ša-aq-dì* appears at Sippar in the 16th century.[3] Although the name is in the genitive, we may assume that it represents an abbreviated form of a name with the ending *î/iya*, as suggested by the Ugaritic PN *ṯqdy*,[4] which must mean something like "protector" or "guardian."

The verbal root *šqd* was in use in Phoenician-Punic and Hebrew during the 1st millennium. It appears in a Carthaginian ritual text that probably dates from the 3d century B.C.E.: *wtyn y' lbn lqḥt tšqd*, "and you will be careful to take fine white figs."[5] In a real estate sales contract dated in 668 B.C.E.,[6] the ptcp. *šōqēḏ* functions as a divine epithet in what is probably a Phoenician personal name: *ab-di-li-šu-qíd*, "servant of the god who takes care."[7] The meaning "watch, take care of (someone or something)" for *ṯqd/šqd* is also found in Hebrew, where the verb appears in the qal. In Hebrew we also find the ptcp. *šōqēḏ* used as a noun and the noun *šᵉqîḏâ*, "care."

2. *Almond.* The initial consonant of the Semitic word for the almond tree and its fruit is also the voiceless interdental *ṯ*. This is clear from the earliest instances of the Akkadian word *šiqdu*,[8] which Old Akkadian documents of the 3d millennium write as *ši-iq-dum* or *si-iq-dum*;[9] the sign *ŠI* is used for *ṯi*, while the variant *SI* bears witness to the shift *ṯ* > *š*, which was taking place in Akkadian during this period.[10] The use of *ṯqd*, "almond," in the hippiatric texts from Ugarit confirms the orthography of the Old Akkadian texts.[11] The Ugaritic texts also confirm the use of two common species of almond: the bitter almond *(ṯqd mr)*[12] and the "sweet almond," the only edible species, known in Akkadian as *šiqdu matqu*.[13] The Ugaritic word was probably pronounced *ṯuqdu*, as suggested by the pl. *ᵍⁱšᵘ-uq-du-ma*, found in a syllabic cuneiform text.[14]

The Heb. *šāqēḏ* means both "almond tree" (Jer. 1:11) and "almond(s)" (Gen. 43:11; Nu. 17:23[Eng. 8]; Eccl. 12:5). In the latter meaning it appears also in a Phoenician papyrus fragment dating from the end of the Persian period or the beginning of the Hellenistic period, where the text clearly has the pl. *šqdm*, "almonds."[15] The Aramaic equivalent, attested in both Syriac and Jewish Aramaic, appears in the form *šᵉḡēḏtā'* or

1. M. J. É. Gautier, *Archives d'une famille de Dilbat* (Cairo, 1908), no. 1, r. 8.
2. M. Birot, *RA* 49 (1955) 16-17, IV. 3(= 6), 40(= 43); cf. *ARM*, XVI/1, 231.
3. *CT*, VIII, pl. 10b, 8; 14a, 8.
4. *KTU* 4.103, 49.
5. *KAI* 76B.5.
6. Lipiński.
7. S. Dalley and J. N. Postgate, *Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud*, III (London, 1984), no. 57, 2.
8. *AHw*, III, 1247.
9. *MAD*, III, 282-83.
10. *MAD*, II, 30-40.
11. *KTU* 1.17, 6; 1.72, 10; 1.85, 7; 1.97, 12.
12. D. Pardee, *Les textes hippiatriques* (Paris, 1985), 55-56.
13. *AHw*, II, 633; *CAD*, X/1, 413.
14. *PRU*, VI, 159, 4′.
15. *KAI* 51.6.

šigḏā', with *g* replacing *q*, a common phenomenon in Mandaic. In any case the term must be an Akkadian loanword, since West Semitic *ṯqd* would normally become *tqd* or *tgd* in Aramaic. The borrowing is confirmed by the occurrence of a Syriac variant, *šqdt'*, which reflects Akk. *ši-qit-tum/tú* or *ši-qid-du.*[16] The native Aramaic name of the almond tree and its fruit was *lûz*, a word that appears in Biblical Hebrew only in the story of Jacob's sojourn among the Arameans in Haran (Gen. 30:37). Eth. *sĕgd/sĕgād* is probably also a loanword.[17]

There is also a Hebrew adj. *mešuqqāḏ*, belonging to the technical vocabulary of arts and crafts, which appears as a denominative pual participle derived from *šāqēḏ*. It must mean "shaped like an almond blossom," although the Tg. translates it vaguely as *meṣayyar*, "decorated" or "chased," and the LXX uses the periphrastic translation *ektetypōménoi karyískous*, "nut-shaped," or *karyōt*, "decorated with nuts." Since the adjective always describes the cups of the lampstand in the temple (Ex. 25:33-34; 37:19-20) and the text adds the detail that the cups must be envisaged as having "calyx and petals" *(kaptōr wep̱eraḥ)*, *mešuqqāḏ* can hardly be translated "almond-shaped." It must refer to the blossoms of the almond tree, which belongs to the family *Rosaceae* and is extremely beautiful in bloom. It is therefore likely that the description of the decoration of the lampstand as *mešuqqāḏ* refers to a typological and esthetic aspect of the object.

II. Usage. The use of *šqd* < *ṯqd* in Hebrew is associated primarily with the notion of watching or guarding. The verb can thus appear in combination with *šmr*, "keep, watch" (Ps. 127:1; Prov. 8:34; Ezr. 8:29). The object watched varies: gates (*šqd 'l*, Prov. 8:34), a city itself (Ps. 127:1; cf. Jer. 5:6), a treasure (Ezr. 8:29; Sir. 31:1; 42:9). The leading priests who set out from Babylon to return to Jerusalem must "guard" the gold and silver vessels for the temple (Ezr. 8:29). Sir. 31:1 paints a picture of a "wakeful rich man" *(šōqēḏ 'āšîr)* who puts all his energy into guarding his wealth; 42:9 says that "a father's daughter is a treasure to be guarded" *(maṭmōneṯ šōqēḏ)*.[18] In a similar vein, 4Q159 2-4 1 speaks in a fragmentary context of "guardian of the family" (*šwqd mšpḥ*[*h*]). Isa. 29:20 uses the oxymoron of "evil guardians" *(šōqeḏê 'āwen)*.[19] Job 21:32 also alludes to a guardian or watcher who clearly calls to remembrance the *nepeš*[20] or *yāḏ* (15:12; 2 S. 18:18) of the departed, set upon his tomb: "But he is carried to his grave, and a watch is kept over his tomb" *('al-gāḏîš yišqôḏ)*. The figurative language of Ps. 102:8(7) appears to liken the psalmist to a night watchman, sitting as lonely as a barn owl (hardly a sparrow [LXX]) atop a house: "All my life I keep watch like a lonely bird on the housetop."

Although Ps. 127:1 compares Yahweh to a guard who keeps watch over a city, the vb. *šqd* is used almost ironically, even with God as subject. According to Jer. 31:28 and

16. *AHw*, III, 1247-48.

17. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 491.

18. On the syntax see *GK*, §113e.

19. On the attributive genitive, which often takes the place of a nonexistent adjective, see *GK*, §128p.

20. *DISO*, 183-84.

prepare the fodder well." There is nothing about "staying awake," as the LXX presumes.

In Lam. 1:14 the LXX translation *egrēgorḗthē epí . . .* , "He has risen up against my transgressions," confirms the Hebrew consonantal text, which does not, however, admit this interpretation. The Masoretes vocalized it as *niśqaḏ ʿōl,* probably thinking of the Jewish Aramaic root *śqd,* "spur on,"[22] and the use of *ʿōl,* "yoke," in the sense of "yoke of oxen, team." This proposed interpretation makes excellent sense in Lam. 1:14a: "The yoke of my transgressions has been spurred on, at the touch of his hand." Emendation would appear superfluous. Therefore the verse should not be cited as an instance of *šqd* niphal, since we actually have a niphal of *śqd* > *sqd,* "urge on, spur on."

Lipiński

---

22. Jastrow, 1019.

שָׁקָה *šāqâ* → שָׁתָה *šāṯâ*

שָׁקַט *šāqaṭ*

I. Etymology. II. Distribution. III. Qal in Military Contexts: 1. Finite Forms; 2. Participle. IV. Qal in Other Contexts: 1. Peace; 2. Cessation of Activity. V. Hiphil: 1. Causative; 2. Reflexive. VI. Noun. VII. LXX. VIII. Later Hebrew and Aramaic.

šāqaṭ. R. Albertz, "Schalom und Versöhnung," in T. Strohm et al., eds., *Friede ist der "Weg zum Frieden." Theologia practica* (Hamburg, 1983), 16-29; J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968), esp. 91; G. Buccellati, "2 Re 11,20," *BeO* 1 (1959) 81; B. Costacurta, *La vita minacciata. AnBibl* 119 (1988), esp. 276; A. Fanuli, "Il riposo come approdo del lavoro umano nella Bibbia," in G. de Gennaro, ed., *Lavoro e riposo nella Bibbia* (Naples, 1987), 25-48, esp. 36-37; I. Gabriel, *Friede über Israel. ÖBS* 10 (1990), esp. 117-26; 186f.; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörteruch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 165-67; A. Ruffing, *Jahwekrieg als Weltmetapher. SBB* 24 (1992), esp. 82, 137-38, 220-23; E. A. Speiser, "The 'Elative' in West-Semitic and Akkadian," repr. in *Oriental and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia, 1967), 465-93, esp. 492; E. Ullendorff, *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden, 1977), esp. 83; Wagner, esp. 117; J. P. Weinberg, "Krieg und Frieden im Weltbild des Chronisten," *OLP* 16 (1985) 111-29.

I. Etymology. In the Semitic languages we find the roots *šqṭ* and *škt/skt,* whose meanings cannot always be delimited precisely. For example, Akk. *sakātu(m)* means "be silent,"[1] as does Syr. *škt;*[2] Arab. *skt* means "be quiet, calm,"[3] but also "be silent, speechless."[4] This root appears in Biblical Hebrew as the rare vb. *sāḵaṯ,* meaning "be silent" (hiphil in Dt. 27:9 [LXX *siṓpa*]; niphal in Sir. 13:23: *ʿšyr dwbr hkl nsktw* [ms. A; LXX *ploúsios elálēsen kaí pántes esígēsan*]). Much more common in the OT, with more than 40 occurrences, is the vb. *šāqaṭ.* The qal is generally assigned the meaning "be quiet, undisturbed" (cf. already LXX). Morphologically, *šāqaṭ* corresponds to Arab. *sqṭ,* "fall"; this meaning can hardly provide a criterion for determining the semantic content of the Hebrew verb,[5] although Kopf[6] claims a semantic relationship between "fall" and "be quiet." There is another Hebrew vb. *šāṯaq,* possibly the product of metathesis, which also means "be quiet, silent" (Jon. 1:11,12; Ps. 107:30; Prov. 26:20); it is found in Ugaritic[7] and more frequently in Samaritan, Aramaic, and Rabbinic Hebrew.[8] In Biblical Hebrew the vbs. *dmm,*[9] *ḥāšâ,* and *ḥrš* hiphil also mean "be quiet."

This quantitative and semantic evidence makes it safe to assume that *šāqaṭ* underwent a development independent of *sāḵaṯ,* which is only marginally attested in Biblical Hebrew; semantic interference with *sāḵaṯ* and Arab. *skt,* with the meaning "be quiet, silent," is conceivable, but hardly with Arab. *sqṭ.*

II. Distribution. In epigraphic texts *šqṭ* appears in Lachish ostracon 6.6;[10] the partially reconstructed form has been interpreted as a hiphil infinitive construct, meaning "to loosen, to make sink [or: rest] the hands."[11] In Biblical Hebrew the root *šqṭ* appears as a verb in the qal and hiphil; the only exception is the hapax legomenon *šeqeṭ* in 1 Ch. 22:9, a noun found also in the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as in Middle and Modern Hebrew.[12] No other derivatives are found in Biblical Hebrew.

There are characteristic concentrations of the verb in Judges, Isaiah, Job, and 1-2 Chronicles. The word also appears in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, with scattered occurrences in Joshua, Ruth, Proverbs, and Sirach. It does not occur at all in the Pentateuch.

III. Qal in Military Contexts. The qal of the verb is commonly used to express the aftermath of military actions and oppression.

---

1. *AHw,* II, 1011-12.
2. *LexSyr,* 777-78.
3. G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum,* 4 vols. (Halle, 1830-37), II, 335.
4. Lane, I/4, 1389.
5. Barr, 90-91.
6. P. 165.
7. *KTU* 1.12, II, 57-59.
8. Wagner, 117 (no. 319); *HAL,* II, 1641; *WTM,* IV, 619-20.
9. → דמה *dāmâ.*
10. H. Torczyner, *Lachish Letters,* I (London, 1938), 113-14.
11. *DISO,* 318; *KAI* 196.6-7; II, 196-97; *TSSI,* I, 46.
12. See VIII below.

1. *Finite Forms.* In this context *šāqaṭ* can denote the state of internal and external peace that ensues when military actions have come to an end. The subject is usually a collective (*'ereṣ, 'am,* PN, etc.) that no longer faces a military threat. The so-called rest formula of the "Book of Deliverers" may be cited as an example: it says in stereotyped language that, following the victory of a deliverer over a particular enemy, the land *(hā'āreṣ)* "had rest" *(tišqōṭ)* for a period of 30 to 80 years (Jgs. 3:11,30; 5:31; 8:28). These formulas are ascribed to a pre-Dtr redactional stratum.[13]

Other passages in comparable contexts sometimes expand the formula: according to Josh. 11:23 and 14:15, after the battles of the conquest the land had rest from war; according to 2 Ch. 23:21//2 K. 11:20, the city of Jerusalem had rest and the people of the land rejoiced after Athaliah had been killed. According to 2 Ch. 20:30, the realm of Jehoshaphat had rest after the defeat of Israel's enemies; this statement parallels the statement that God gave rest (*nwḥ* hiphil) all around.[14] In addition, after the war between Abijah and Jeroboam, Judah had rest for 10 years under Asa (2 Ch. 13:23 [14:1]). This statement is repeated in an appended notice describing the removal of foreign cults by the same king (v. 14[15], with *mamlāḵâ* as subject). Finally, the absence of war during the reign of Asa is tantamount to rest for the land (v. 5[6]) — and an opportunity to fortify its cities. Here too the rest is ascribed to Yahweh's giving peace (*nwḥ* hiphil).

We also find the motif of God-given rest in prophetic texts. In Isa. 14:1,3, Yahweh grants Israel and Jacob rest; after they have escaped oppression and returned to their homeland, they can sing in a taunt song that the whole earth is at rest (*nāḥâ šāqᵉṭâ kol-hā'āreṣ,* v. 7). Jeremiah's oracle of comfort also links the promise of deliverance and return from exile with the assurance that Jacob will have rest, living secure and unafraid (*wᵉšāqaṭ wᵉša'ᵃnan wᵉ'ên maḥᵃrîḏ,* Jer. 30:10//46:27).

2. *Participle.* Various passages use the qal participle to describe the situation of a city or a people before a war or before destruction. During the Danites' occupation of their territory, for example, they found in Laish a people living "quiet and carefree" (*'am šōqēṭ ûḇōṭēaḥ,* Jgs. 18:27) until the city was taken and they were put to the sword. The same language was used previously (18:7) to describe Laish; here the text adds that they were "living in security after the manner of the Sidonians" *(yôšeḇeṯ-lāḇeṭaḥ kᵉmišpaṭ ṣiḏōnîm),* i.e., they engaged in commerce and agriculture.[15] In the Early Iron Age, according to Boling,[16] only an earthen rampart protected the city.

The feminine form of the participle means that formula almost certainly must mod-

---

13. For a detailed analysis see W. Richter, *Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in den deuteronomistischen Epoche. BBB* 21 (1964), 61-62, 113-14; for a critical response see U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum. BZAW* 192 (1990), 84-90.

14. On the concept of rest in the Chronicler's special material, see Gabriel, 186-87; Ruffing, 219ff.

15. J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1981), 272.

16. R. G. Boling, *Judges. AB* (1975), 263.

ify the toponym in the preceding clause.[17] Whether the clause *wᵉʾên maḵlîm dāḇār bāʾāreṣ yôrēš ʿeṣer* that follows *šōqēṭ ûḇōṭēaḥ* embodies a reference to the interpretation of this expression depends on the interpretation of *maḵlîm.* If the clause means that no one in the land criticized the one in authority, this would not provide a motive for the attack;[18] if it means that there was no one in power who spoke with authority,[19] the clause may explicate *šōqēṭ ûḇōṭēaḥ.*

As in the case of the Danites, the Meunim (categorized as Hamites) also experienced the violent conquest of their territory, which had been described as "quiet and peaceful" (1 Ch. 4:40-41).

Apart from the accounts of the conquest, the qal participle appears in Jer. 48:11; here is foretold the destruction of Moab, which hitherto had lived "quietly on its lees" — i.e., it was able to develop like an undisturbed wine, protected from exile. In Ezk. 38:11 Gog plans to attack the defenseless land and its quiet and carefree inhabitants *(haššōqᵉṭîm yōšᵉḇê lāḇeṭaḥ),* who have no fortified cities. Zec. 1:11 is less clear. Here the prophet is told that the whole earth is at peace. This statement is usually associated with the revolts following Darius's assumption of power. If these revolts fed hopes that the empire was on the verge of breaking up, *šāqaṭ* would once again denote the (deceptive) quiet before the chaos of war; but some scholars have challenged this interpretation.[20]

IV. Qal in Other Contexts.

1. *Peace.* In the passages cited we have identified an element of untroubled peace and quiet; three texts in Sirach use the qal or qal participle to ascribe this state to individuals. Sir. 41:1 (ms. B) speaks of the thought of death, bitter to one who is at peace among possessions, carefree, prosperous, and still vigorous. In the hymn honoring ancestors, 44:6 (ms. B) speaks of rich men living peacefully with their possessions, without going into detail. By contrast, 40:6 (ms. B) speaks of the deceptive peace of someone pursued by nocturnal visions,[21] who can snatch only brief moments of peaceful sleep. Job 3:13 says that Job, had he died shortly after birth, would now be at peace and not be exposed to the constant perils of the living, who like him have no rest.

2. *Cessation of Activity.* a. *Action Emphasized.* In Ruth 3:18 Naomi says that Boaz will not rest until *(lōʾ yišqōṭ . . . kî-ʾim)* he has fulfilled his obligations as *gōʾēl.* The state of rest (not further qualified) will not be achieved until a particular matter has been settled. In Isa. 62:1, similarly, God cannot keep silent and rest until vindication and salvation have come to Jerusalem. In Ezk. 16:42 Yahweh's calm *(wᵉšāqaṭtî)* is preceded by his wrath against faithless Jerusalem, which he brings to rest (*nwḥ* hiphil). In

17. Soggin, *Judges,* 272.

18. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, I. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 114.

19. A. A. Macintosh, *VT* 35 (1985) 68-77; cf. the criticism of Soggin, *Judges,* 272-73.

20. K. Seybold, *Bilder zum Tempelbau. SBS* 70 (1974), 95; R. Hanhart, *Sacharja 1–8,23. BK* XIV/7/1 (1998), 61-68.

21. G. Sauer, "Jesus Sirach," *JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 603.

Jer. 47:6 the prophet asks the sword of Yahweh when it will finally rest; it cannot rest, is the answer, until it has carried out Yahweh's orders (v. 7).

b. *Inactivity Emphasized.* In other cases the sequence is reversed: the text refers to a state of rest that is to be replaced by a specific activity. In Ps. 83:2(Eng. 1), the psalmist appeals to God not to be silent and inactive. Positively, in Isa. 18:4 Yahweh expresses his intent to remain quiet (*'ešqᵒṭā*[22]) and look from his place before intervening (v. 5). No precise sequence is suggested in Ps. 76:9(8), where the earth is still, fearing God's judgment.

V. Hiphil.

1. *Causative.* The hiphil is used causatively in Prov. 15:18 (one who is slow to anger calms contention [*yašqîṭ rîḇ*]) and Ps. 94:13 (Yahweh's discipline and teaching give respite from days of trouble).

2. *Reflexive.* More often, the hiphil is used reflexively. God cannot be condemned for remaining quiet (*yašqîṭ,* Job 34:29). The earth is still because of the south wind, i.e., the growth of vegetation is interrupted (Job 37:17). The *rᵉšā'îm* are like the tossing sea, which cannot keep still (Isa. 57:20). The same image reappears in Jer. 49:23.[23]

The aspect of carefree ease is also present in some occurrences of the hiphil. In Ezk. 16:49 God accuses Sodom of living in prosperous ease without regard for the poor and needy. The opposite situation obtains in several passages in Isaiah. In Isa. 7:4, with the Syro-Ephraimite troops advancing, Isaiah is to tell Ahaz to take heed, to be quiet, and not to fear *(šmr* niphal, *šqṭ* hiphil, *'al-yārē');* 30:15 declares that Israel's salvation lies in return and rest, its strength in quietness and trust; in 32:17, finally, the fruit of righteousness is said to be quietness and trust.

In the last two passages, in contrast to those cited in III.2 above, it is clear that *šāqaṭ* and *bāṭaḥ* and their derivatives do not refer to the carefree mentality that allows a people living in what seems to be a time of peace to fall victim to a surprise attack. In the face of blatant invasions, these texts demand a response that resembles the calm serenity of peacetime, a trust in Yahweh's intervention rather than military mobilization. In these examples, too, we see once more the semantic relationship between the vbs. *šāqaṭ* and *bāṭaḥ* (cf. Jgs. 18:7,27 and Ezk. 38:11); in addition, *šāqaṭ* is linked in various ways with *šālâ* and its derivatives (Ezk. 16:49; Job 3:26; 1 Ch. 4:40; Sir. 41:1). Here *šāqaṭ* clearly does not mean "be silent"; as in most cases, the accent is more on quiet serenity. In Isa. 62:1 and Ps. 83:2(1), by contrast, verbs belonging to the lexical field of silence do not function as antonyms of *šāqaṭ.*

VI. Noun. In 1 Ch. 22:9 Yahweh says that he will give Israel peace and quiet *(šālôm wāšeqeṭ)* during the reign of Solomon; this expression parallels "peace from enemies on every side." Thus the noun retains the aspect of carefree security.

---

22. On the form see JM, §7b.

23. On its translation see D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, II. OBO* 50/2 (1986), 809-10.

VII. LXX. The LXX usually translates *šāqaṭ* with words derived from the stem *hēsych-,* less often with *pepoithénai, (kata)praúnein, anapaúein, kopázein,* or *eirēneúein.* For *šeqeṭ* we find *hēsychía.*

VIII. Later Hebrew and Aramaic. The Dead Sea Scrolls contain one instance of the hiphil with a causative sense (*qwl gylwt rnh hšqyṭ,* 4Q405 20-21-22 12-13) and three instances of the noun *šeqeṭ* (1QH 12:2; 4Q381 50 4;[24] 4Q503 69 1[25]). Although it is very difficult to reconstruct the context in these three texts, in 1QH 12:2 the expression *lbṭḥ bm'wn q*[*wdš bš*]*qṭ wšlwh,* "secure in a h[oly] dwelling place [in pe]ace and quiet," stands out; the terminology is familiar from Biblical Hebrew.[26] In 4Q503 69 1, too, we find *šlwt šq*[*ṭ*]. Both the noun and the verb occur in Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic. Here the verb appears in the G stem and the causative stem, in the latter only with a causative sense.[27]

Bons

24. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 191-92.
25. M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III. DJD,* VII (1982), 126.
26. Lohse, 156-57.
27. *ANH*³, 433; Jastrow, 1621-22; *WTM,* IV, 602.

שָׁקַל *šāqal;* שֶׁקֶל *šeqel;* מִשְׁקָל *mišqāl*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Weight. III. Coin. IV. Theological Usage. V. LXX. VI. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāqal. J. W. Betlyon, "Coinage," *ABD,* I, 1076-89; K. Deller and K. Watanabe, "*šukkulu(m), šakkulu* 'abwischen, auswischen,'" *ZA* 70 (1980/81) 198-226; J. C. Greenfield, "The Root *šql* in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Aramaic," *UF* 11 (1979) 325-27; U. Hübner, "Die Münzprägung Palästinas in alttestamentlicher Zeit," *Trumah* 4 (1994) 119-49; R. Kletter, "The Inscribed Weights of the Kingdom of Judah," *TAJ* 18 (1991) 121-63; B. Lang, "Münze," *BL*², 1182-85; E. Martin-Pardey, "Waage," *LexÄg,* VI, 1081-86; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (Tel Aviv, 1967); L. Mildenberg, "Die *Yəhūd*-Münzen," appendix to H. Weippert, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Munich, 1988), 719-28; N. Mundhenk, "The Translation of *Shekel*," *BT* 37 (1986) 237-38; M. A. Powell, "Masse und Gewichte," *RLA,* VII, 457-516, esp. 479, 489-90, 510-14; A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (Jerusalem, ²1947); R. B. Y. Scott,

I. 1. *Etymology.* We are dealing here with two homonymous roots:[1]

a. *šāqal* I, "weigh," is cognate with Akk. *šaqālu(m),*[2] Ugar. *ṯql,*[3] Aram. *tql* (Dnl. 5:27),[4] Pun. *šql,*[5] and Arab. *ṯiql,* "weight, heaviness." It also appears in the Greek loanword *síklos.*[6]

b. *šāqal* II, "take (away), wipe away," is cognate with Akk. *šukkulu(m)/šakkulu,*[7] Ugar. *šql,*[8] and Jewish Aram. *šᵉqal.*[9]

All occurrences in OT texts involve meaning (a), "weigh," which in conjunction with metal shifts to the meaning "weigh out, pay."

2. *Occurrences.* The root *šql* appears in the OT in the form of the vb. *šāqal* (22 times, usually in the qal, 3 times in the niphal [Job 6:2; 28:15; Ezr. 8:33]), the noun *šeqel* (88 times, 42 of which are in the sg.), and the derivatives *mišqāl/mišqôl,* "weight" (50 times) and *mišqeleṯ/mišqōleṯ,* "plummet, level" (1 K. 21:13; Isa. 28:17). It may also appear in the toponym *'ašqᵉlôn,* "Ashkelon" (12 times, once [Josh. 13:3] as a gentilic), although the etymological connection is problematic.

II. Weight. Weighing was reserved for valuable metals like gold (Ex. 38:24; 2 Ch. 3:9), copper (Ex. 38:29; 1 S. 17:5), or iron (1 S. 17:7); food was generally measured by volume, rarely by weight (Ezk. 4:10). In everyday life, therefore, weights did not play nearly as important a role as measures of capacity. Weight was normally determined by a balance scale with two movable pans adjusted to be in equilibrium when empty. To determine weight, the substance to be weighted was placed on one pan; stone weights were placed on the other until equilibrium was restored. It is reasonable to assume that the stone weights (weights of other materials such as lead are also found) were calibrated to match an official standard in the hands of the palace or temple; such a system is suggested by the terms "king's weight" (2 S. 14:26) and "sanctuary shekel" (Ex. 30:13,24; 38:24-26; Lev. 5:15; 27:3,25; Nu. 3:47,50; 7:13-88; 18:16). Throughout the ancient Near East, the basic unit of weight was the "shekel," even though the weight of a shekel could vary substantially from region to region and in different periods, and could also depend on the role of the person doing the weighing: a seller often used lighter weights than a buyer.

"The Shekel Sign on Stone Weights," *BASOR* 153 (1959) 32-35; idem, "Weights and Measures in the Bible," *BA* 22 (1959) 11-40; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, esp. 203-6; H. Weippert, "Gewicht," *BRL²*, 93-94; idem, "Waage," *BRL²*, 355.

1. See Greenfield on the distinction between the two roots.
2. *AHw,* III, 1178-79; *CAD,* XVII/2, 1-13.
3. *UT,* no. 2735; *WUS,* no. 2930.
4. *ANH³*, 447.
5. *KAI* 69.7; *DISO,* 318.
6. K. Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs* (Heidelberg, 1927), no. 1880.
7. *AHw,* II, 1027; III, 1590; cf. Deller and Watanabe; also *AHw,* III, 1178: *šaqālu(m)* G.5, D.3.
8. *UT,* no. 2472.
9. *ANH³*, 434; 1QapGen 21:9.

The relationship of the shekel to other weights appears to have been quite ingenious. Weights of less than a shekel were the *nṣ̌b* (attested only archaeologically), weighing $^{20}/_{24}$ — i.e., $^{5}/_{6}$ — of a shekel (sometimes interpreted as half a shekel); the *pîm* (1 S. 13:21), weighing $^{2}/_{3}$ of a shekel; the *beqaʿ* (Gen. 24:22; Ex. 38:26), "a half shekel"; and finally, as the smallest unit of weight, the *gērā*, $^{1}/_{24}$ (or $^{1}/_{20}$?) of a shekel (Ex. 30:13; Lev. 27:25; Nu. 3:47; 18:16; Ezk. 45:12). Weighing more than a shekel was the *māneh*, "mina" (1 K. 10:17; Ezk. 45:12; Ezr. 2:69; Neh. 7:70-71; Dnl. 5:25-26), equivalent to 50 (Ugaritic) or 60 (Mesopotamian) shekels. Much larger was the *kikkār*, "talent," weighing 3,000 shekels (according to Ex. 38:25-26). The MT of Ezk. 45:12 appears to increase the weight to the mina, making it equivalent to 60 shekels, after the analogy of the Mesopotamian system.[10]

Translating this information into modern weights is not without its problems. Detailed studies and comparisons of inscribed stone weights indicate that a shekel weighed approximately 11.33 grams (0.4 ounces), at least in Judah during the later monarchy.[11] The details of the differing systems used in various regions and periods, and especially the manner of subdivision into smaller units, pose a difficult problem.[12]

III. Coin. The shekel served also as a monetary unit (Gen. 23:15; 2 K. 7:1; Jer. 32:9; Am. 8:5; etc.). When monetary amounts are given in gold or silver, the word "shekel" is often omitted as being understood (Gen. 20:16; 24:22; 37:28; 45:22; Lev. 27:15; Nu. 7:13; Dt. 22:19,29; Jgs. 8:26; 16:5; 17:2-3; 2 S. 18:11-12; 1 K. 10:16; 2 K. 6:25; Isa. 7:23; Hos. 3:2; Zec. 11:12-13; Ps. 119:72; Cant. 8:11). From the 5th century on, with the appearance of coinage in Palestine, "shekel" also became the name of a coin. The time when shekels were first minted is uncertain. In the time of Nehemiah, who was the first to be granted the right to coin money in Judah,[13] there is literary evidence for a silver shekel (Neh. 5:15) and one-third shekel (Neh. 10:33[Eng. 32]). According to the archaeological evidence, the first Yehud coins were struck between 390 and 350 B.C.E.[14]

According to Ex. 30:13, the temple tax was half a shekel, a "holy offering to Yahweh"; according to Neh. 10:33, the tax was only one-third of a shekel. Saul offers to pay the man of God a quarter shekel (1 S. 9:8).

IV. Theological Usage. God loves honest balances (Lev. 19:36; Ezk. 45:10; Prov. 16:11) and hates dishonest balances (Hos. 12:8[7]; Am. 8:5; Mic. 6:11; Prov. 11:1; 20:23). Like boundary stones and measures of capacity, balances are among the fundamental instruments of order that are under the special watch and protection of the Deity.

---

10. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 474, 477.

11. Kletter.

12. Scott; *AncIsr,* I, 205-6; Weippert; Kletter, with bibliog.

13. Reifenberg.

14. On the types, value, and distribution of foreign coins and local coins minted in the provinces of Judah and Samaria, see Mildenberg, Betlyon, and Hübner.

In the context of a controversy oracle, Isa. 40:12 sums up the incomparability and incomprehensibility of Israel's God in the awestruck question, "Who can weigh the mountains in a scale?" The obvious answer is "No one." Another, bolder possibility is: "Only Yahweh."[15]

In Job's great oath of purgation, with the Decalog in the background, Job goes through the various ways in which he might have burdened himself with guilt. He accepts God's curse if he has sinned in any respect: adultery, disregard for the poor and powerless, transgression of the first commandment through misplaced trust in the power of wealth or the celestial bodies, refusal of hospitality, false testimony concerning his own conduct, spilling of innocent blood. In this context he challenges God: "Let God weigh my heart in a just balance" (Job 31:6). This image reflects an ancient Egyptian idea:[16] in the presence of Osiris and the gatekeepers, the heart of one who has died is weighed in a balance against Maat, "Truth." The scribe Thoth records the result — and sometimes manipulates it, helping "Truth" a bit by pulling on one of the pans of the balance to "justify" the departed.[17] Should the result be unfavorable, the "soul eater," a dreadful monster, stands ready to devour the soul. In Egyptian religion this weighing in an honest balance represents a highly critical moment.[18] Similar notions are found in other civilizations: Dike and Themis, the Greek goddesses of justice and order, are symbolized by a balance. A few rather distant parallels to Job 31:6 are found in OT wisdom literature (Prov. 16:2; 21:2; 24:12). There is, however, no trace in the OT of any notion of a judgment after death. Weighing is a metaphor for a meticulous examination of a living individual on the part of God.

Fohrer interprets Job 6:2 as a "variation" of the "Egyptian idea": Job would have his pain and vexation weighed in the balance, in order to determine his innocence.[19]

The enigmatic message written on the wall by a mysterious hand for Belshazzar to read (Dnl. 5 [Aramaic]) contains a play on words dependent on the ambiguity of unpointed texts. The words *mᵉnēʾ mᵉnēʾ tᵉqēl ûparsîn* (v. 25), "counted: mina, shekel, and half shekel,"[20] are probably an ironic and increasingly pejorative assessment of kings:[21] the great Nebuchadnezzar is worth a mina, the arrogant Belshazzar only a shekel, the kings of Media and Persia two half-minas. The names of other kings have also been proposed.[22] Daniel, however, finds verbal forms in the nouns (vv. 26-28): *mᵉnēʾ, tᵉqēl, pᵉrēs,* "counted, weighed, divided," with a probable allusion to the Per-

---

15. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 47-50, listing supporters of both interpretations.

16. C. Seeber, *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Totengerichts im alten Ägypten. Münchener ägyptologische Studien* 35 (1976); K. Koch, *Geschichte der ägyptischen Religion* (Stuttgart, 1993), 223-24, 299-331, 576-88, with bibliog.

17. Koch, *Geschichte,* 576, fig. 158.

18. See ch. 25 of the Book of the Dead.

19. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 168.

20. O. Eissfeldt, *ZAW* 63 (1951) 105-14 = *KlSchr,* III (1966), 210-17.

21. E.g., A. Bentzen, *Daniel. HAT* I/19 (^{2}1952), 42, 51; E. Haag, *Daniel. NEB* (1993), 50-51.

22. J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel. WBC* 30 (1989), 111.

Isa. 28:16, express the idea that the members of the community are God's handpicked elite, tested meticulously with the "balance of the sun" to be incorporated into God's "wall" or "planting."

Oeming

שקף *šqp;* שֶׁקֶף *šeqep;* שְׁקֻפִים *šᵉqupîm;* מַשְׁקוֹף *mašqôp*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and Usage. III. Theological Usage. IV. Architectural Terms: 1. *mašqôp;* 2. **šeqep;* 3. *šᵉqupîm.* V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. Some lexicons list two roots *šqp*, deriving the verbal forms from one and the nouns **šeqep, šᵉqupîm,* and *mašqôp* from the other.[1] It is not difficult, however, to posit a single root, the verb having the basic meaning "appear in a (window) frame, show one's face."[2] Labuschagne treats *šqp* as a shaphel form of the root **qwp* (a variant of *nqp* II), found in the noun *tᵉqûpâ.*[3]

II. Occurrences and Usage. The vb. *šqp* has a truly restricted basic meaning: "look out/down." Of its 22 occurrences, 10 are in the niphal (Nu. 21:20; 23:28; Jgs. 5:28; 1 S. 13:18; 2 S. 6:16; Jer. 6:1; Ps. 85:12[Eng. 11]; Prov. 7:6; Cant. 6:10; 1 Ch. 15:29) and 12 in the hiphil (Gen. 18:16; 19:28; 26:8; Ex. 14:24; Dt. 26:15; 2 S. 24:20; 2 K. 9:30,32; Ps. 14:2; 53:3[2]; 102:20[19]; Lam. 3:50). The niphal "emphasizes the stative aspect of 'overhanging,' which makes the form suitable as a geographical term."[4] The "standpoint of the observer" is said to dominate.[5] The hiphil, by contrast, "foregrounds the

---

šqp. G. Boström, *Proverbiastudien. LUÅ* I/30.3 (1935), esp. 106, 120-23; T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes,* I (Leiden, 1970), esp. 134-36, 193-97; K. Galling, "Miscellanea Archaeologica 1. Steinerne Rahmenfenster," *ZDPV* 83 (1967) 123-25; idem and H. Rösel, "Fenster," *BRL²*, 79-80; C. van Gelderen, "Der salomonische Palastbau," *AfO* 6 (1930/31) 100-106, esp. 102-3; M. Görg, "Fenster," *NBL,* I, 665-66, with bibliog.; idem, "Lexikalisches zur Beschreibung des salomonischen Palastbezirks (1 Kön 7,1-12)," *BN* 11 (1980) 7-13, esp. 12-13; K. Möhlenbrink, *Der Tempel Salomos. BWANT* 59 (1932), esp. 128-29; H.-P. Müller, "Begriffe menschlicher Theomorphie," *ZAH* 1 (1988) 112-21; K. Rupprecht, "Nachrichten von Erweiterung und Renovierung des Tempels in 1. Könige," *ZDPV* 88 (1972) 38-52, esp. 40-41.

1. *GesB,* 861-62; *BDB,* 1054.

2. M. Noth, *Könige I: 1.Kön. 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 98; see also the discussion of *šᵉqupîm* in IV.3 below.

3. C. J. Labuschagne, "Original Shaphʿel-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OT Studies. OTWSA* 10 (1971), 54.

4. Müller, 115.

5. *HAL,* II, 1645.

action of looking out and down";[6] the perspective of "the one observed" is dominant.[7] The contexts in which the verb appears are limited. It is noteworthy that, with the exception of Eccl. 12:3 and Cant. 2:9, *šqp* is used only to denote looking out of a window-like opening. Most passages refer to a view from a superior perspective: certain regions dominate others, a viewer looks down, women looking out a window can see others without being seen. This perspective is consonant with the failure of a few passages to state (directly) who or what is observed.

We shall now consider the occurrences in detail. Three passages describe a landscape as dominating another, i.e., overlooking it (Nu. 21:20; 23:28; 1 S. 13:18; cf. Jer. 6:1). Abraham and his visitors look down on Sodom (and Gormorrah) (Gen. 18:16; 19:28; cf. 2 K. 9:32). In 2 S. 24:20 *šqp* means "keep a lookout" — Arauna has been waiting for David. Many passages speak of women (and also men: Gen. 26:8; Prov. 7:6) looking out of a window. Abimelech looks out and sees Isaac fondling Rebekah (Gen. 26:8). Sisera's mother worries about her son (Jgs. 5:28). Michal sees David leaping and dancing before the ark ("before Yahweh," 2 S. 6:16). Jezebel looks out the window, sees Jehu, and compares him to the regicide Zimri (2 K. 9:30).

According to the MT of Prov. 7:6, the wisdom teacher (speaking in the 1st person: *nišqāptî*) or personified Wisdom herself[8] observes through a window how the strange woman ensnares a simple youth. The LXX reads *parakýptousa.* This feminine participle has given rise to far-reaching religio-historical interpretations. Boström, who considers the reading of the LXX to be original, connects this passage with Aphrodite Parakyptusa, whose cult is attested in various places, including Cyprus.[9] In the figure of Astarte (Ishtar, Kilili), this erotically charged window goddess also appears elsewhere in the ancient Near East. At Samaria, Arslan-Tash, Nimrud,[10] and Khorsabad, ivories have been found that depict the "woman at the window."[11] In the unlikely event that the LXX does preserve the earlier text, it would still remain an open question whether *parakýptousa* refers to the strange woman or to Lady Wisdom.

III. Theological Usage. Almost half the occurrences of *šqp* are in theological contexts. God looks down (from heaven) to intervene in human affairs — to bless, to help, to destroy — or to scrutinize human conduct. Dt. 26:15 calls on Yahweh to look down from his holy habitation, from heaven, and bless his people Israel. In Ps. 102:20-21(19-20) he looks down from his holy height, at the earth from heaven, to hear the groans of the prisoners and to set free those who are condemned to death. Lam. 3:50 waits for Yahweh to look down in pity. In Ps. 85:12(11) "righteousness" is

6. Müller.

7. *HAL,* II, 1645.

8. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 334ff.

9. Cf. W. F. Albright, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," in M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas, eds., *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 10.

10. *ANEP,* no. 131.

11. See the discussion in Müller, 116.

the subject of *šqp:* faithfulness springs up from the ground and righteousness looks down from heaven, i.e., takes effect on earth. In Ex. 14:24 Yahweh's *šqp* has devastating consequences: he looks down on the Egyptian army from the pillar of fire and cloud and causes it to panic. In Ps. 14:2 (= 53:3[2]) Yahweh looks down from heaven to see if there is anyone who seeks after God; the following verse makes clear that Yahweh's hopes are disappointed.

This same theologoumenon appears in an extended sense in Cant. 6:10: the beloved looking down is likened to the dawn (a Canaanite goddess). In vv. 8-10 she is described as having godlike features; therefore she is blessed *('šr)* and praised *(hll),* being superior to all other women. Müller, too, finds here a lyric transformation of formerly mythological motifs.[12]

IV. Architectural Terms.

1. *mašqôp̱.* The architectural term *mašqôp̱,* a *maqṭāl* form, denotes the lintel of a doorway (cf. *mip̱tān,* "doorsill"). According to Ex. 12:7,22-23, the Israelites are to put blood on the two doorposts and the lintel of their houses. It has been suggested occasionally that the noun also appears in 1 K. 7:5 (reading *reḇuʿîm šāqep̱* as *reḇuʿê mašqōp̱*).[13]

2. **šeqep̱.* The meaning of **šeqep̱* is not entirely clear. The noun appears only in 1 K. 7:5. It is conceivable that, like *mašqôp̱,* it means "lintel" (cf. the synagogue inscription of Barʿam, where *šqwp̱* has this meaning).[14] It is assumed more commonly that **šeqep̱* denotes the frame of a door or window. This interpretation is supported by the fact that there are four *peṯāḥîm* associated with the **šeqep̱* (*wehammezûzôṯ* may be an accurate gloss, taken from 1 K. 6:33; but some comms., following LXX, read *wehammeḥezōṯ* instead). The frame would thus have the form of a lattice. On the basis of a complicated etymological derivation from Egyptian, Görg has tentatively proposed the meaning "opening to admit light," but his argument is not persuasive.[15]

3. *šequp̱îm.* Scholars have proposed wildly different and at times bizarre interpretations for the word *šequp̱îm* in 1 K. 6:4 and 7:4.[16] If *šequp̱îm* is the passive participle of the verb, 7:4 omits the noun it should modify (windows); Gray supplies the noun and translates: "latticed (or embrasured) windows."[17] The explanation of Noth has found more acceptance: the word was originally *šeqāp̱îm* (pl. of *šeqep̱*) and was therefore not associated directly with the verb.[18] He translates 6:4 as "(latticed, *ʾaṭumîm*) framework

12. Ibid., 116-17.

13. J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *Kings. ICC* (1951), 166; Noth, *Könige I,* 131.

14. M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik,* I (Weimar, 1898), 485; cf. J. Gray, *I and II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 179.

15. Pp. 12-13.

16. See esp. comms. on 7:4.

17. Cf. Gray, *Kings,* 177-78.

18. *Könige I,* 97-98.

windows"[19] and 7:4 as "frames" or "framing,"[20] and connects the expression with Akk. *askuppu(m), askuppatu,* "stone slab, doorsill."[21] The latticed windows of the temple may have been made of stone (instead of the wood used elsewhere); they were high and not meant to be opened.[22]

V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. Outside the Pentateuch, the LXX always translates *šqp* with *dia-, eis-, ek-, kata-,* or *parakýptein.* In the Pentateuch, besides *parakýptein* (Gen. 26:8), it uses *katideín* (Dt. 26:15) and in four passages *epi-* or *katablépein.* It translates freely in Nu. 23:28 *(tó parateínon . . .).* There were clearly no fixed rules for translating *šqp* into Greek, but the difference between the Pentateuch and the rest of the OT is striking.

The lexeme is not attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Mathys

19. Ibid., 94.
20. Ibid., 130.
21. *AHw,* I, 74; *CAD,* I/2, 333-35.
22. Galling and Rösel.

שִׁקֵּץ *šqṣ;* שֶׁקֶץ *šeqeṣ;* שִׁקּוּץ *šiqqûṣ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Leviticus; 2. Prophetic Literature; 3. Psalms and Daniel. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. Summary.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *šqṣ* has been associated etymologically with Akk. *šaqāṣu,* "give someone the evil eye."[1] According to others,[2] the root is a shaphel form of *qûṣ,* "feel loathing, abhorrence, dread."[3] Elsewhere the root appears only in Jewish Aramaic, possibly under biblical influence.

šqṣ. J. Ernst, "Greuel der Verwüstung," *NBL,* I, 951-52; G. Lindeskog, "Greuel," *BHHW,* I, 608-9; J. Nelis, "Greuel der Verwüstung," *BL²,* 642-43; W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein. SANT* 24 (1970), esp. 27, 66; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971).

→ טמא *ṭāmē'.*

1. *AHw,* III, 1139.
2. Paschen, 27; *HAL,* II, 1646.
3. *HAL,* II, 1089-90; → קוט *qûṭ.*

2. *Occurrences.* The root occurs 46 times in the OT: 16 in the Pentateuch, 6 in DtrH, 19 in the Prophets, 1 in Psalms, 1 in ChrH, and 3 in Daniel, always with the meaning "abominable."

The verb appears 7 times in the piel: 4 times in Leviticus, twice in Deuteronomy, and once in the Psalms. The noun *šeqeṣ* occurs almost exclusively in Leviticus (9 times); there is one occurrence in Isaiah and one in Ezekiel. There are 28 occurrences of *šiqqûṣ:* 1 in Deuteronomy, 6 in DtrH, 5 in Jeremiah, 8 in Ezekiel, 1 each in Isaiah, Hosea, Nahum, Zechariah, and ChrH, and 3 in Daniel. Twenty-one of these occurrences are in the plural, possibly in the abstract sense of "loathsomeness."[4] The singular appears in 1 K. 11:5,7 (bis), 2 K. 23:13 (bis), Dnl. 11:31; 12:11. The root belongs to the lexical field of "uncleanness." It often appears with *ṭmʾ:* 8 times in Leviticus (7:21; 11:23-24,40-41,42-43; 20:25), 4 times out of 9 in Ezekiel (5:11; 20:7,30; 37:23), and twice in Jeremiah (7:30 = 32:34). It is also associated with *tôʿēḇâ* (8 times: Dt. 7:25-26; 2 K. 23:13; Jer. 16:18; 32:34-35; Ezk. 5:11; 7:20; 11:18,21) and *gillûlîm* (5 times: Ezk. 8:10; 20:7,8,30-31; 37:23).

II. Usage. The basic meaning of *šqṣ* is "abominable, abominate." But the root is used in two different senses. The first appears only in Leviticus and refers to forbidden animals. The second is characteristic of Dtr literature, and is connected with the worship of false gods and idols; with only one exception (Zec. 9:7), it is in this context that all occurrences of *šiqqûṣ* appear.

1. *Leviticus.* In Lev. 11, the chapter listing clean and unclean animals, *šeqeṣ* occurs 8 times and the verb 3 times. The noun *šiqqûṣ* does not occur at all in Leviticus. The root is limited to the sections dealing with marine animals (vv. 10-12), birds (vv. 13-19), insects (vv. 20-23), and swarming creatures (vv. 41-43). The section dealing with mammals (vv. 2-8) uses *ṭmʾ*. The noun *šeqeṣ* refers only to animals. The verb appears twice in commands to regard such animals as *šeqeṣ* (vv. 11,13) and once in the prohibition: "Do not make yourselves abominable (with any of these animals)" (v. 43).

The root *ṭmʾ* appears more often in this chapter, since it encompasses a broad spectrum: human beings, clothing, vessels, and grain can all be *ṭāmēʾ*. The two roots are clearly synonymous. Lev. 11:8 *(ṭmʾ)* and 11:11 *(šqṣ)* are essentially identical. In v. 43 the roots are parallel: "Do not make yourselves abominable *(šqṣ)* with these swarming creatures; do not make yourselves unclean *(ṭmʾ)* with them." The two roots are also parallel in Lev. 7:21, although here the Syr., SP, and Tg. read *šōrēṣ*, "swarming creatures," instead of *šeqeṣ*. Comparison of Lev. 11 with Dt. 14:3-21 confirms the synonymity of the two roots, since Deuteronomy always uses *ṭmʾ* rather than *šqṣ* to refer to forbidden animals.

There is a difference, however: *šeqeṣ* has a narrow range of usage and refers only to certain kinds of animals, whereas in Lev. 11–15 *ṭāmēʾ* is the general term for ritual un-

4. *GK*, §84b,i.

32:34), meaning either cult objects or the cultic practices associated with them. Similarly, Yahweh's statement, "If you remove your *šiqqûṣîm, . . .*" in 4:1b can refer either to idols or to cultic practices. In 13:27 "your *šiqqûṣîm*" include such scandalous deeds as "your adulteries, your lecherous neighings, your shameless prostitutions on the hills (and) in the countryside." In 16:18 Jeremiah describes the pollution of the land: "They have polluted my land with the carcasses of their detestable idols *(šiqqûṣêhem)* and have filled my inheritance with their abominations *(tô'ᵃḇōṯêhem)*."

In Ezekiel *šqṣ* occurs 9 times (only 6 reflected in LXX). Except in 20:30, it always appears in combination with *tô'ēḇâ* (5:11; 7:20; 11:18,21) or *gillûlîm* (8:10; 20:7-8; 37:23). Ezekiel associates *šqṣ* with the priestly function of distinguishing what is clean from what is unclean, lest the people "bring abomination on themselves" (*wᵉlō'-ṯᵉšaqqᵉṣû,* Lev. 20:25). He connects *šiqqûṣîm* with idols in 7:20 *(ṣᵉlāmîm)* and 20:7-8 *(// gillûlê miṣrayim).* As in Jeremiah, the other occurrences of *šiqqûṣ* may refer both to idols and to their worship. No other prophet emphasizes as clearly as Ezekiel the correlation between the "loathsomeness" of Israel and ritual impurity.[9] The prophet combines the priestly and the Dtr usage of the root *šqṣ* by using both *šeqeṣ* and *šiqqûṣîm.* In 8:10 he uses the language of Dt. 4:17-18 to describe the cultic reliefs he sees in the temple: "many images of creeping things and animals, abominations *(šeqeṣ),* and all the idols *(gillûlîm)* of the house of Israel." Instead of *šeqeṣ,* the LXX appears to have read *šiqqûṣîm,* a precise parallel to *gillûlîm,* as elsewhere in Ezekiel (20:7-8; 37:23). As Greenberg[10] notes, the verse describes images of prohibited animals.[11] They represent not only idols *(gillûlîm)* but also abominable animals *(šeqeṣ),* vividly expressing Israel's sinfulness. Here the priestly and prophetic usages of the root *šqṣ* coalesce.

Finally, Isa. 66:1-4 condemns foreign idol worship and summarizes the apostasy of Israel in v. 3b: "They choose their own ways and take delight in their *šiqqûṣîm*."[12]

Prophetic usage consistently follows the model of Hos. 9:10: *šiqqûṣ* has to do with foreign gods — in the first instance their images, but also their whole cult. Yahweh finds all this utterly abominable. Ezekiel in particular emphasizes that the people have rendered themselves unclean through *šiqqûṣîm.* Since Yahweh cannot endure such uncleanness, Israel has fallen victim to his punishment.

3. *Psalms and Daniel.* In the Psalms *šqṣ* occurs only once. According to Ps. 22:25(24), Yahweh does not despise *(bāzâ)* or abhor (*šqṣ* piel) the affliction of the poor. This is the only instance of *šqṣ* with Yahweh as subject. Affliction can evoke abhorrence in a human being, but not in Yahweh.

In Daniel *šiqqûṣ* occurs 3 times, in connection with the "abomination of desolation" set up in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. The wording varies: *šiqqûṣîm mᵉšōmēm* (9:27), *haššiqqûṣ mᵉšômēm* (11:31), *šiqqûṣ šōmēm* (12:11). As in 1 K. 11:5,7, the singular form *(šiqqûṣ)* is appropriate here, since we are dealing with a single cult object.

---

9. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 240-41.

10. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20. AB* (1983), 169-70.

11. See II.1 above on Leviticus.

12. See C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1969), 413-14.

The plural in 9:27 may represent a partial dittography. The expression *šiqqûṣ mᵉšômēm* probably contains a play on *baʿal šāmayim,* "Lord of Heaven," the Phoenician counterpart to Zeus.[13] (Nestle pointed out that Hos. 9:10 contains a similar negative allusion to Baal.)[14] The use of *šiqqûṣ* suggests that here, as in Dtr and prophetic literature, the text does not refer to an altar but to the image of a god (cf. also 1 Mc. 1:54).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *šqṣ* 6 times with *prosochthízein,* twice with *eídōlon,* and once (Jer. 32:34) with *miásmata.* Otherwise it always uses *bdélygma.*

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The verb appears once in the Dead Sea Scrolls in connection with unclean animals, just as in Leviticus (CD 12:11). But it also has a broader meaning, as in CD 7:3: "Let no one defile his holy spirit." The same is true in 1QS 10:22, which speaks of *šiqqûṣîm* upon the tongue; it is not clear whether the word is synonymous with the parallel "sophistries and lies" or denotes another kind of inappropriate speech.

Totally unique (and not found in the OT) is the construct phrase *šqwṣy twʿbwtyhm* in 4QpNah 3:1, which must belong to the interpretation of Nah. 3:5 (4QpNah 2:10-12) but prepares the way for the quotation from Nah. 3:6-7, in which *šiqqûṣîm* appears.

The verb appears 3 times in the Temple Scroll: 2:10 cites Dt. 7:25-26 (*figura etymologica;* the second occurrence is reconstructed); 51:8 borrows the wording of Lev. 11:43 (cf. 20:25) and extends it inclusively.

IV. Summary. In the lexical field of "uncleanness," *šqṣ* is less common that *ṭmʾ* or *tôʿēḇâ;* it is about as frequent as *gillûlîm* but is distributed more broadly. In both priestly and prophetic contexts *šqṣ* expresses "the strongest revulsion"[15] and abomination on the part of Yahweh toward uncleanness and idolatry. Just as contact with abominable animals (*šeqeṣ,* Lev. 11) makes a person "abominable" (Lev. 11:43; 20:25), contact with foreign gods (*šiqqûṣ,* 1 K. 11:5,7) makes Israel similarly "abominable" (Dt. 7:26; Hos. 9:10).

Freedman/Welch

---

13. J. A. Montgomery, *Daniel. ICC* (²1949), 388-89; L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *Daniel. AB* (1978), 252-53.

14. E. Nestle, *ZAW* 4 (1884) 248.

15. Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea,* 541.

שקר šqr; שֶׁקֶר šeqer

I. 1. Cognates; 2. Distribution and Basic Meaning. II. Verb. III. Noun: 1. Basic Meaning; 2. Law; 3. Cult; 4. Extended Usage. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Cognates.* The root *šqr* has been well studied.[1] Nevertheless, its broad semantic spectrum — from "break a contract or treaty" (verb in Gen. 21:23) to "vanity" (noun in Jer. 37:14 and Prov. 31:30) — occasionally makes it difficult to determine its precise sense in a particular passage.

The most recent data are presented by *HAL.* The root appears in Ugaritic as *šqr.*[2] In Middle Hebrew the piel means "deceive, lie," and the hithpael "be convicted of lying" (cf. 1QS 6:24: "give false evidence"). Especially important is the Old Aramaic pael:[3] *šqr l* (with persons), "break an agreement with someone"; *šqr b,* "break an agreement."[4] In Jewish Aramaic and Palestinian Aramaic the verb means "lie, deceive, break faith." The Syriac pael (= Mand. *šqr*) means "lie, deceive." On the noun *šeqer,* cf. Sam. *ašqar;* Akk. *tašq/gertu(m),* "slander, deception";[5] Syr. *šuqrā',* "lie" (appearing as a loanword in Arab. *s/šuqar,* "lie"); Jewish Aram. and Mand. *šiqrā',* "lie, falsehood."

2. *Distribution and Basic Meaning.* The verb appears only 6 times (once in the qal, 5 times in the piel). The segholate noun, by contrast, occurs 113 times. The cj. *šaqqār* in Prov. 17:4[6] is uncertain, because *šeqer,* "falsehood," can characterize a per-

---

šqr. W. Bühlmann, *Vom rechten Reden und Schweigen. OBO* 12 (1976), esp. 16-17; J.-H. Cha, "Micha und Jeremia" (diss., Bonn, 1993); D. Giering-Jänsch, "Der 'Vorwurf gegen Gott'" (diss., Bonn, 1993); H. Goeke, "Das Menschenbild der individuellen Klagelieder" (diss., Bonn, 1971), esp. 63-65; F. Horst, "Eid II. Im AT," *RGG*³, II, 349-50; H. W. Huppenbauer, "Lüge," *BHHW,* II, 1108-9; M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (1964); idem, "שקר *šqr* to deceive," *TLOT,* III, 1399-1405; T. W. Overholt, "Remarks on the Continuity of the Jeremiah Tradition," *JBL* 91 (1972) 457-62; idem, *The Threat of Falsehood. SBT* 2/16 (1970); W. H. Schmidt, H. Delkurt, and A. Graupner, *Die Zehn Gebote im Rahmen alttestamentlicher Ethik. EdF* 281 (1993), esp. 125-30; H. Seebass, "Eid II. AT," *TRE,* IX, 376-77; I. L. Seeligmann, "Zur Terminologie für das Gerichtsverfahren im Wortschatz des biblischen Hebräisch," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 251-78; M. Wagner, "Beiträge zur Aramaismenfrage im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 355-71, esp. 364-65.

1. Klopfenstein, *Lüge;* idem, *TLOT;* Wagner, "Beiträge," 364-65; *HAL,* II, 1647-50.

2. *KTU* 2.31, 26; on *KTU* 2.36+, 9, see M. Dijkstra, *UF* 21 (1989) 141-52, esp. 141-42.

3. Sefire, *KAI* 222A.14,15,24; 222B.23,38; 223A.3; 223B.9,14,17-18; 224.4,7,9,14,16,19,20, 23,27.

4. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 8; R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10. bis 8. Jh.v.Chr. AKM* 38/3 (1969), 70, 134; *DISO,* 319.

5. *AHw,* III, 1139; but probably not *šikaru* (*HAL,* II, 1648, with bibliog.).

6. G. R. Driver, *ZAW* 50 (1932) 144; rejected by *HAL,* II, 1650; A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16 (1991), 284.

son.[7] The distribution of the 119 occurrences of the root is significant: 37 in Jeremiah; 24 in Psalms; 20 in Proverbs; 8 in Isaiah; 4 each in Leviticus and Zechariah; 3 in Exodus; 2 each in Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Micah, Job, and 2 Chronicles; and 1 each in Genesis, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Ezekiel, Hosea, Habakkuk, and Malachi.

The basic meaning appears to be "act deceptively" (in contrast to "speak deceptively"). The emphasis may be on deceptive intent (faithless, breach of faith, breach of contract, lie) or on unreliability (to the point of irrelevance or vanity). According to Klopfenstein, "the original meaning should be paraphrased as 'breach of a contractually regulated or otherwise self-evident relationship of faithfulness and trust.'"[8] The root plays an outstanding role in the legal system[9] because Israel's legal ideology is based in large measure on the presupposition of self-evident fidelity and trust. This presupposition is particularly clear in the importance of witnesses for the legal system.[10]

II. Verb. The earliest occurrence of the verb (Gen. 21:23 E) is highly significant because, like the Sefire occurrences,[11] it appears in the context of a treaty, and hence means "violate a treaty/covenant with someone" (qal with *l*ᵉ introducing the person). By guaranteeing Abraham's use of the well at Beer-sheba, a site whose strategic importance should not be underestimated,[12] Abimelech of Gerar binds the patriarch Abraham together with his descendants to his kingdom, as in the Sefire treaty.[13] In the presence of Abimelech's commander, Abraham must undertake to conduct himself with *ḥeseḏ* toward the kingdom of Abimelech, with a guarantee of property rights.

The instances of the piel do not focus so specifically on legal issues.[14] Translated into a theological statement, the same language appears in Ps. 44:18(Eng. 17), in the setting of a communal lament:[15] "All this has come upon us, yet we have not forgotten you, or been false to your *b*ᵉ*rîṯ*." The exilic lament in Isa. 63–64* places in Yahweh's mouth the confident expectation, framed by statements declaring God's steadfast love for his people,[16] "Surely they are my people, children who will not deal falsely" (63:8). In Ps. 89, also an exilic communal lament, v. 34(33) says that even if David's descendants sin, Yahweh will not remove his *ḥeseḏ* from him or be false to his faithfulness (*'*ᵉ*mûnâ*), will not violate his *b*ᵉ*rîṯ* (v. 35), or alter what has gone forth from his lips. These occurrences, probably none of them early, thus fit well in the semantic space of the basic meaning.

---

7. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 198, 201; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (²1963), 72-73.
8. *TLOT,* III, 1400-1401.
9. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 17; *HAL,* II, 1648.
10. See III.2 for examples.
11. See I.1 above.
12. H. Seebass, *Genesis I: Urgeschichte* (1996), in loc.
13. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 8.
14. Cf. *HAL,* II, 1647.
15. P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50. WBC* 19 (1983), 331-34.
16. I. Fischer, *Wo ist JHWH, unser Vater? SBB* 19 (1989), 35-36, 39, and passim.

emphasizing intent. It appears as direct object or prepositional object with *'āśâ* (2 S. 18:13; Jer. 6:13; 8:10), *p'l* (Hos. 7:1; cf. Prov. 11:18), *bṭḥ b/'l* (Jer. 13:25; 28:15; 29:31), as an adverbial accusative with *'wt* piel, "oppress" (Ps. 119:78), *rdp*, "persecute" (Ps. 119:86), *'yb*, "treat with hostility" (35:19; 69:5[4]), and *śn'*, "hate" (38:20[19]; 119:163). Antonyms include derivatives of the root *'mn* in the sense of "truth, trustworthiness" (Jer. 5:1-3; 9:2,4[3,5]; Zec. 8:16-17; Ps. 119:29-30,96; Prov. 11:18; 12:17,22; 14:5). The antithesis of truth and falsity appears significantly with *šb'* niphal, "swear" (Jer. 4:2; Ps. 89:50[49]; 132:11; contrast Lev. 5:22,24; 19:12; Jer. 5:2; 7:9; Mal. 3:5) and *nb'* niphal, "prophesy" (Jer. 23:28; 26:15; 28:9; contrast Jer. 5:31; 20:6; 27:15; 29:9).

Ps. 33:17 is clear: a horse is not a lie but does not guarantee victory and is therefore a "vain hope." In this category, too, belong such passages as Job 13:4: "worthless physicians" (with "cook up lies"); Mic. 2:11: "utter empty falsehoods"; Jer. 13:25: "forget Yahweh and trust in lies"; Jer. 7:4,8: words that urge trust in the temple rather than in Yahweh; and also the interjection "wrong, a lie!" (2 K. 9:12; Jer. 37:14; cf. Jer. 40:16), found in early texts. If we summarize the evidence concerning the noun's basic meaning, noting the not infrequent association with words denoting speech (some 35 instances),[26] the element of objective damage comes through clearly.

2. *Law*. It is therefore clearly appropriate to follow Klopfenstein in beginning with the legal sphere. To the extent that descriptions of the ancient Israelite forensic system have been preserved, we observe that it depended extensively on witnesses in both civil and criminal cases; a lying witness therefore represented a significant danger to the society governed by this legal system (Prov. 6:19; 14:5; 25:18; pl.: 12:17; Ps. 27:12).[27] Dt. 19:16-21 contains stringent regulation if the accusation involve a crime of violence: the false witness suffers the punishment that the crime would have brought. Prov. 19:5,9 probably reflect such a regulation: "A false witness will not go unpunished, and a liar will not escape."[28]

The antonym *'emeṯ* (Prov. 14:25 [here in contrast to *kzb*]) probably recalls the principle that for evidence what matters is not the intent of the witness (cf. the worthless witness in Prov. 19:28) but rather the witness's unreliability. The earliest relevant passage (Ex. 23:7) is unfortunately not entirely clear: "Keep far from a word/matter of *šeqer*." Since v. 1 has already dealt with false witness and v. 2 with false majorities, the admonition to the lay judge or prosecutor may caution against judging on the basis of recognizably untrustworthy evidence.[29] Also to the legal sphere belong the lying tongues of Ps. 109:2; Prov. 6:17; 12:19; 21:6; 26:28, and the lying lips of Ps. 120:2; Prov. 12:22;

26. Ibid., 1011.

27. Seeligmann, 263; see also already Amenemope, chap. 13, 19-20 (I. Shirun-Grumach, *TUAT*, III/2, 238-39, 242-43).

28. According to Meinhold, *Sprüche*, 313, 315-16, v. 5 is probably a secondary addition.

29. J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 114 (1975), 434: a warning against trying anyone on false charges of any kind; see also L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch. BZAW* 188 (1990), 385.

17:7, as well as lying speech that infects all areas of public life (Mic. 6:12, par. "tongues of deceit").

A false oath is different in nature. Since the OT does not mention an oath taken by witnesses, but only an oath of purgation taken by the accused and a promissory oath acknowledging a future obligation,[30] the purpose of an oath is clearly to establish that a commitment will be kept. In both cases the oath is taken in the name of Yahweh, so that failure to keep it is an offense against Yahweh (Lev. 5:22,24; 19:12; Jer. 7:9; Zec. 5:4; 8:17; Mal. 3:5). Ps. 144:8,11 complain of enemies "whose mouths speak worthlessness[31] and whose right hands are false *(yᵉmîn šāqer).*" Because the right hand was raised in taking an oath, this verse could refer to a false oath; why not also a false deed?

The fundamental social importance of the forensic situation is enshrined forever in the eighth/ninth commandment (Ex. 20:16; cf. the series in Jer. 7:9); it is well known that this commandment does not condemn lying in general[32] but rather demands the solidarity that is requisite above all for confidence in trustworthiness before the law. (The parallel in Dt. 5:20 is disputed, because the expression *ʿēḏ šāw'* occurs only here.)[33]

3. *Cult.* In the cultic sphere we find once more a reflex of the public and legal meaning of the noun; we also find certain usages peculiar to this sphere. Insofar as prophets participate in the cultic sphere, we are dealing with a sphere that affects the public but is distinct from the legal sphere.

a. The complaints against enemies in the Psalms include the motif of false accusations and charges. Ps. 27:7-13 should probably be interpreted as the prayer of someone accused unjustly;[34] the forensic language is still very much in evidence.[35] The psalmists complain at length about lying speech, tongues, lips, etc. (*dāḇār,* Ps. 63:12[11]; 101:7; cf. Isa. 59:3,13; *lāšôn,* Ps. 109:2; cf. Prov. 6:17; 12:19; *śāpâ,* Ps. 31:19[18]; 120:2; cf. Isa. 59:3; Prov. 12:22). We also find prayers against those who hate wrongfully or without cause (Ps. 38:20[19]), accuse falsely (35:19; 69:5[4] in a forensic context), oppress with guile (119:78), are pregnant with mischief and bring forth lies (7:15[14]), and smear the psalmist with lies (119:69). In prayers of the king (101:7) and for the king (63:12[11]), such liars certainly have no prospects (cf. also Isa. 32:7).

Here we may note that in the most important Mesopotamian "Job texts,"[36] lies and slander are major motives causing the sufferer (always a person of high status) to bring charges against the personal god; only this god or the king can defeat them.[37] An exten-

30. Horst, 349-50; Seebass, *TRE,* IX, 376-77.

31. → שׁוא *šāw'.*

32. See the distinctions drawn in Schmidt, Delkurt, and Graupner, 127-28.

33. Ibid., 127.

34. H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angelklagten im AT. BZAW* 49 (1928), 15-16.

35. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 28-32.

36. Sumerian Job, ll. 26ff. (W. H. P. Römer, *TUAT,* III/1, 104-5); *AO* 4462, l. 15b (W. von Soden, *TUAT,* III/1, 137); Babylonian Theodicy, ll. 279-80 (W. von Soden, *TUAT,* III/1, 157).

37. Giering-Jänsch, 74-131.

sive wisdom tradition in Egypt views the prevention of slander, false witness, etc., as one of the elements necessary for the stability of the kingdom.[38]

Ps. 119 is a rich source of information about the usage of the noun. V. 118 reads: "You spurn all who go astray from your *ḥuqqîm,* for their cunning [LXX: their thinking] is in vain *(šeqer)*." This language leads to the metaphor of the "path/way of lies," an allusion to the "deceptive/false path" (vv. 29 [*dereḵ šeqer*], 104,128 [*'ōraḥ šeqer*]), which the psalmist rejects. In this context it would be unwise to distinguish precisely among "deceptive," "false," and "unreliable."

b. Jeremiah shaped the complaint that the people have forgotten Yahweh and put their trust in delusion (other deities; Jer 3:23; 13:25). In secondary material the gods themselves are a fraud (10:14 = 51:17; 16:19; cf. Isa. 44:20, referring to an idol). This usage issues in the metaphor of a "brood of lies/deception" to describe idolaters (Isa. 57:4). Hab. 2:18 and Zec. 10:2 probably characterize the oracles of the nations as unreliable.

c. This brings us to the problem of "prophet against prophet," which also involves the cultic sphere. Mic. 2:11 (cf. 3:5-8)[39] introduces the theme: the people love prophets who profess to be inspired and prophesy empty falsehoods *(šeqer kizzēḇ).* Jeremiah expands on it in Jer. 5:31; (14:14?); 20:6; (27:15). The conflict reaches its peak in Jeremiah's attack on Hananiah, whom he accuses of enticing the people to trust in lies (28:15; cf. also 29:31). We also find "prophesy by means of deception" (29:23) and "deal falsely" (6:13//8:10; cf. 23:14). Jer. 6:13//8:10 explicitly includes priests among the prophet's enemies. The (early) gloss in Isa. 9:14(15) is brutally succinct: "The elders and dignitaries are the head, the prophet who teaches lies is the tail." The (non-Dtr) addition in 1 K. 22:22-23 blames the confidence of King Ahab of Israel in victory at Ramoth-gilead on an inspired delusion (with the *rûaḥ* turned into a member of God's heavenly court) infecting Ahab's court prophets.[40]

4. *Extended Usage.* The noun also appears outside these well-defined spheres. During Absalom's revolt, a soldier tells Joab that he refused to kill Absalom, which would have been acting treacherously, violating the king's orders (2 S. 18:13). Speaking in Yahweh's name, Hosea points to blatant offenses through which Ephraim has dealt falsely (Hos. 7:1). In Ex. 5:9 Pharaoh condemns the intent of Moses' followers to make an offering to Yahweh in the wilderness as a made-up pretext or empty nonsense *(diḇrê šeqer),* or even rebellion. With bitter irony Isaiah excoriates the "witlings" of Jerusalem, who in their covenant with death have taken refuge in lies and delusion (*kāzaḇ, šeqer,* Isa. 28:14-15). When the sages appeal to the *tôrâ* of Yahweh, Jeremiah counters that the deceiving stylus of the scribes has made the *tôrâ* unreliable (*laššeqer,* Jer. 8:8). Contrariwise, Elihu replies to Job that his words are not false, that he is a man perfect

38. Ptah-hotep, §23 (G. Burkard, *TUAT,* III/2, 209-10); Amenemope, chs. 8–9, 13, 19 (I. Shirun-Grumach, *TUAT,* III/2, 234-36, 238-39, 243-44); Papyrus Insinger 27:1 (H. J. Thissen, *TUAT,* III/2, 311).

39. Cha, 64-105.

40. S. Beyerle and K. Grünwaldt, *TRE,* XXII, 704-7.

Finally, the phenomenon of false prophecy (1QpHab 10:10,12) appears in a variety of contexts; in CD 6:1 (//4Q267 2 6) its goal is to divert Israel from following God. In 4QMMT 3:7-9 the house of one who belongs to the community segregated from the rest of the people must not be infected with deceit and lies (l. 9); the group in power is accused of having been "disloyal to his covenant" (4Q471a 1 2). For other examples see 4QpPs[a] 1:18-19; 4Q172 6 2; 4Q300 2 2:2; 4Q425 1 4; 11QtgJob 24:2,4.

Seebass/Beyerle/Grünwaldt

שָׁרַץ *šāraṣ;* שֶׁרֶץ *šereṣ*

I. Etymology, Occurrences, and Meaning. II. 1. P; 2. Laws. III. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology, Occurrences, and Meaning. The root *šrṣ* is represented by Akk. *šārāṣu,* whose meaning "clutch" is uncertain.[1] Syr. *šᵉraṣ,* "creep," and *šērṣā,* "reptile," are within the semantic sphere of the Hebrew root, as are Sam. *šrṣ* and Jewish Aram. *širṣāʾ*. In Samaritan the verb is found in the qal and pael. In Post-Biblical Hebrew the hiphil of the verb appears to have acquired the denominative meaning "bring forth reptiles." The root has a different meaning in Ethiopic, where we find the vb. *šaraṣa/šarṣa,* "sprout, burgeon," and the noun *šarṣ,* "shoot, scion, twig."[2]

The vb. *šāraṣ* occurs 14 times in the OT, always in the qal. The noun *šereṣ* occurs 15 times. There are significant concentrations of the word in P (8 times) and Lev. 11 (15 times). The remaining occurrences are in Ex. 7:28; Lev. 5:2; 22:5; Dt. 14:19; Ezk. 47:9; Ps. 105:30.

Like the phonetically similar vb. → רמשׂ *rāmaś, šāraṣ* denotes a movement. The *figura etymologica haššereṣ haššōrēṣ* (Gen. 7:21; Lev. 11:29,41-43; cf. Gen. 1:20) shows clearly that the movement in question is characteristic of those creatures re-

---

šāraṣ. M. P. Carroll, "One More Time: Leviticus Revisited," *Archives européennes de sociologie* 19 (1978) 339-46 = B. Lang, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the OT. Issues in Religion and Theology* 8 (Philadelphia, 1985), 117-26; M. Douglas, *Implicit Meanings* (London, ²1999); idem, *Purity and Danger* (London, ²2002); J. Hempel, "Gott, Mensch und Tier im AT," *FS F. Kattenbusch. Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 9 (1931) 211-49 = *Apoxysmata. BZAW* 81 (1961), 198-229; M.-L. Henry, *Das Tier im religiösen Bewusstsein des alttestamentlichen Menschen. SGV* 220/221 (1958) = B. Janowski, ed., *Gefährten und Feinde des Menschen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1993), 20-61; S. Herrmann, "Die Naturlehre des Schöpfungsberichtes," *TLZ* 86 (1961) 413-24 = *Gesammelte Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie. ThB* 75 (1986), 32-46; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 17 (²1967), esp. 122-23; O. H. Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 115 (²1981), esp. 62, 67.

1. *AHw,* III, 1186; cf. *HAL,* II, 1655-56.
2. *LexLingAeth,* 246.

ferred to collectively as *šereṣ*. It can be understood as affecting the environment itself, so that in Gen. 1:20-21; Ex. 7:28; and Ps. 105:30 (cj. *šārᵉṣâ*[3]) the water, the Nile, or the land can be the subject of the verb.[4] The verb may have taken its meaning from the movements and behavior of creatures such as the amphibians that fill both water and land (Ex. 7:28; Ps. 105:30) or the insects that fill the air (Lev. 11:20-23; Dt. 14:19). This would be the simplest explanation of the fact that the noun *šereṣ* can denote not only animals that live in the water (Gen. 1:20-21; Lev. 11:10; Ezk. 47:9) but also small land creatures (Gen. 7:21; Lev. 11:29-31,41-43). Therefore *šāraṣ* must be translated "teem, swarm, crawl." The verb is often constructed with the prep. *'al* (Gen. 7:21; Lev. 11:29,41-42,46) or *bᵉ* (Gen. 8:17; 9:7). The two instances where the verb has a human subject (Gen. 9:7; Ex. 1:7[5]) represent an extension of P's blessing formula.[6]

II. 1. *P.* In the creation account of P (Gen. 1:1–2:4a), the root *šrṣ* (1:20) refers to the living creatures *(nep̱eš ḥayyâ)* that dwell in the waters. There appears to be a distinction between this root and the root *rmś* used in vv. 24-25,28,30 to refer to a portion of the land animals.[7] While the noun *remeś* denotes the creatures that creep on the earth, in contrast to cattle and wild animals of the earth (v. 24), *šereṣ* comprises all aquatic animals; probably, therefore, the noun *hārōmeśeṯ* in v. 21 is a later gloss[8] equating the vbs. *šāraṣ* and *rāmaś* (cf. Gen. 7:21).

In the act of creation itself the aquatic animals are divided into two categories (Gen. 1:21). The first category comprises the great sea creatures or monsters *(hattanînîm haggᵉḏōlîm),* whose original mythological background (Isa. 27:1; 51:9; Ps. 74:13; Job 7:12)[9] appears to have lost its significance in P. The other animals are subsumed without distinction under the term "living creatures" *(kol-nep̱eš haḥayyâ).* The aquatic animals and the birds are created on the fifth day. Although v. 20 of the creation account makes the waters *(hammayim)* the subject of *šāraṣ,*[10] unlike the earth in vv. 11 and 24, the narrative does not assume that they have creative potential.[11] In contrast to the land animals, the aquatic animals are included explicitly in the blessing of creation (v. 22).

In the deluge narrative (Gen. 7:21) *šereṣ* replaces *remeś* in the sequence that includes cattle and wild animals (cf. 1:24-25; 8:17); as in 7:21, the vbs. *šāraṣ* and *rāmaś* are used with reference to land animals. P's choice of words in 7:21 may reflect the fact that the waters of the flood threaten "all flesh that moved on the earth" *(hārōmēś 'al-hā'āreṣ).*

In 8:17 *šāraṣ* parallels *pārâ* and *rāḇâ.* This usage represents an extension of the

3. See *BHS.*
4. *GK,* §117z; *Synt,* §90d; Meyer, §105.3a.
5. M. Gruber, *BethM* 33 (1987/8) 171-75.
6. See II.1 below.
7. → XIII, 513.
8. Schmidt, 123.
9. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 137-38; → תנין *tannîn.*
10. See I above.
11. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 136; Steck, 61-62.

promise of increase *(pᵉrû ûrᵉḇû),*[12] which P includes in the blessing of creation (1:22,28). Here *šāraṣ* replaces *mālē'* in 1:22,28; therefore the LXX translates *šāraṣ* in 9:7 with *plēroún.* The vb. *šāraṣ* expresses the restless or moving fullness of life on earth. The commandment to increase and multiply given to the animal world in 8:17 is addressed to humankind in 9:7; in Ex. 1:7, finally, this increase is fundamental to the development of Israel.[13]

2. *Laws.* In the regulations governing clean and unclean animals, the verb and noun usually refer to small animals. It is noteworthy that this root, like *rmś,* is used mostly for animals considered unclean (*ṭāmē',* Lev. 5:2; Dt. 14:19; cf. Lev. 22:5) or detestable (*šeqeṣ,* Lev. 11:20,23,41-42).[14] Certain kinds of locust constitute an exception among winged creatures (*šereṣ hā'ôp̱,* Lev. 11:21-23); the original of this passage in Dt. 14:19 does not mention the exception. In the secondary expansions of Lev. 11,[15] *šereṣ* denotes small animals collectively. The structure of these regulations goes on to distinguish creatures that live in the water (v. 10), the air (vv. 21-23), and on dry land (vv. 29-31,41-43).[16] Finally, the concluding summary (v. 46) organizes the animal world into cattle, flying animals, aquatic animals, and small land animals; *rāmaś* denotes the movement of animals in the water, *šāraṣ* the movement of animals on land.

III. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. In most cases the LXX translates the verb (like *rāmaś*) with *hérpein* and the noun with *herpetós.* We also find *exágein* and *kineín* used twice for the verb, and *ekzeín, exérpein, exereúgesthai, plēthýnein,* and *plēroún* used once.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls only a single instance of the noun has been found to date (11QT 50:20); it denotes collectively the animals that are unclean (cf. Lev. 11:29-31).

Waschke

---

12. → רב *raḇ.*
13. W. Brueggemann, *ZAW* 84 (1972) 397-414.
14. → XIII, 513-14.
15. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 140-55.
16. E. S. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1996), 132.

שָׁרַק *šāraq;* שְׁרֵקָה *šᵉrēqâ;* *שְׁרִקָה* *šᵉriqâ;* *מַשְׁרוֹקִי* *mašrôqî

I. Etymology. II. Usage: 1. General; 2. Individual Texts. III. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. Heb. *šrq* is cognate with Syr. *šrq,* "hiss, whistle";[1] Jewish Aram. *šrq,* "hiss, whistle";[2] and Mand. *šrq,* "utter shrill and incoherent sounds, screech, whistle."[3]

II. Usage. 1. *General.* The lexeme *šrq* occurs 25 times in the OT: the verb 12 times, the noun *šᵉrēqâ* 7 times (plus probably Jer. 18:16[4]), the plural form *šᵉriqôṯ* once, and the Aramaic plural forms *mašrô/ōqîṯā'* 4 times. Only once (Dnl. 3:7) does the lexeme appear in a narrative; elsewhere it always occurs in "incantational" speech.

2. *Individual Texts.* a. *Verb.* The vb. *šrq* occurs 3 times with *lᵉ* and with Yahweh as subject, whistling for people to come: the Assyrians against his people (Isa. 5:26; 7:18) or his people in exile (Zec. 10:8).

In the 9 other occurrences of the verb (7 abs., 2 with *'al*), the whistling takes place at a heap of ruins, probably with apotropaic intent. In 4 instances we find the expression "Everyone passing by (*kol 'ōḇēr 'al* [sc. the temple/Jerusalem/Edom/Babylon]) will be appalled *(yiššōm)* and whistle *(wᵉšāraq/wᵉyišrōq)* [NRSV: hiss]" (1 K. 9:8; Jer. 9:8b[Eng. 9b]; 49:17; 50:13). Of these texts, 1 K. 9:8 and Jer. 9:8b(9b) are Dtr; Jer. 49:17 and 50:13 are dependent on the latter.[5] The related text Zeph. 2:15, "Everyone who passes by it [sc. Nineveh] will whistle *(yišrōq)* and shake the fist," was probably inserted by a redactor.[6] Shaking one's fist may also be an apotropaic gesture; at the same time it is an expression of malicious gloating. This holds true for Lam. 2:15a: "All who pass along the way clap their hands at you; they whistle *(šārᵉqû)* and wag their heads at daughter Jerusalem," with the continuation in v. 16aα: "All your enemies open their mouths against you; they whistle *(šārᵉqû),* they gnash their teeth," and for Job 27:23, describing the death of a wicked man: "They clap their hands at him and whistle at him *(wᵉyišrōq 'ālāw)* at his departure *(mimmᵉqōmô).*"[7] Whether "a faint trace of mockery"[8] can be detected in Ezk. 27:36a, "The merchants among the peoples whis-

---

šāraq. G. Sauer and B. Reicke, "Pfeiffen," *BHHW,* III, 1436-37; A. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York, 1969), esp. 324-25.

1. *LexSyr,* 810.
2. *ANH*³, 435.
3. *MdD,* 476.
4. See II.2.b below.
5. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 223.
6. A. Deissler, *Zwölf Propheten III. NEB* (1988), 244.
7. → X, 306.
8. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 69.

tle at you *(šārᵉqû ʿālāyiḵ)*," is uncertain. It is probably a later addition to the *qinah* over Tyre.[9]

b. *Nouns.* The use of the vb. *šrq* for what is probably an apotropaic action to avert evil is reflected in the noun *šᵉrēqâ,* "whistling" (NRSV "hissing"), which always appears in conjunction with *šammâ,* "horror." Except for 2 Ch. 29:8, the pair always occur in the context of a prophetic threat, highly stereotyped. The usual form is: "And I/he [sc. Yahweh] will make/made [*śûm* or *nāṯan*] Jerusalem/Judah/Jerusalem and Judah a horror, a thing to be whistled at *(lišrēqâ)*" (Jer 19:8a; 25:9b; 29:18b; Mic. 6:16b; 2 Ch. 29:8). Jer. 19:9 and 25:9 are Dtr,[10] as are 29:18[11] and Mic. 6:16.[12] Jer. 25:18 is post-Dtr;[13] in it, it is the prophet who carries out the threat. Jer. 51:37 (not Jeremianic[14]) contains a related form: "Babylon shall become *(wᵉhāyᵉṯâ)* . . . an object of horror and of whistling."

Jer. 18:16a, "making *(śûm)* their land a horror, a thing to be whistled at [*K šᵉrûqaṯ; Q šᵉrîqōṯ*] forever," should perhaps be emended to *šᵉrēqaṯ,* to accord with the usage of the noun elsewhere.[15] This emendation might be supported by the formulaic continuation in v. 16b: "All who pass by it are horrified and shake their heads."

The Aramaic noun *mašrô/ōqîṯā'* (pl.) appears in second place in the stereotyped list of instruments sounded as a signal that all are to fall down and worship the image set up by Nebuchadnezzar (Dnl. 3:5,7,10,15). It clearly refers to wind instruments, possibly flutes or pipes.[16]

Jgs. 5:16a is difficult: "Why did you [sc. Reuben] tarry *(yšb)* among *hammišpᵉṯayim,* to hear *šᵉriqôṯ ʿᵃḏārîm,*" usually translated "the piping of shepherds."[17] Arguing from the predominant usage of the lexeme *šrq,* Beckmann instead interprets *šᵉriqôṯ* negatively and the flocks metaphorically: Reuben has settled *(yšb)* in a location such that apotropaic whistling awaits him.[18]

III. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX usually (11 times) uses *syrízein* to translate the verb (*sēmaínein* in Zec. 10:8). For the nouns it uses *syrigmós* 6 times *(sýrigma* in Dnl. 3:5, with *sýrinx).* In 5 instances (Jer. 29:18; 51:37; Dnl. 3:7,10,15) the Hebrew text has no equivalent in the LXX.

To date, only the noun *šrqh* has been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in a formula (11QT 59:4) that recalls Jer. 25:9.

Schmoldt

9. Ibid.

10. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 223, 271.

11. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 17-18.

12. H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. tr. 1990), 197-98.

13. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 223.

14. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 297-98.

15. *HAL,* II, 1656-57; F. Stolz, *TLOT,* III, 1372-73.

16. Sendrey, 324-25.

17. E.g., J. A. Soggin, *TLZ* 106 (1981) 630.

18. U. Beckmann, *Das Deboralied zwischen Geschichte und Fiktion* (St. Ottilien, 1989), 147-48.

שְׁרִרוּת *šᵉrirûṯ*; שׁרר *šrr* I; שָׁרִיר *šārîr*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Nouns. II. OT: 1. Lexical Field; 2. Formal Observations; 3. Theology. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The lexicons agree that the nouns *šᵉrirûṯ* and *šārîr* derive from a verbal root *šrr* I, which does not appear in the OT but is well attested in other Semitic languages.[1] Its meaning, however, is difficult to define, and can at best be approximated.

The Ugaritic occurrences of *šrr,* "authenticate," are all disputed as to both reading and interpretation.[2] The lowest common denominator may be an affirmatory aspect associated with the root: "make firm, pack,"[3] "truly, indeed."[4] Thus the Ugaritic pl. *mšrrm*[5] might mean "stabilizers," tare weights on a scale.[6]

A similar affirmatory aspect appears in Akk. *šarrumma,* "certainly,"[7] and *šurrumma,* "verily."[8] Von Soden[9] cautiously proposes instead a connection with *šurrû(m),* "beginning," and Salonen[10] even suggests a relationship with *šarru(m),* "king."

In Egyptian Aramaic we find the adj. *šryr,* "happy,"[11] and the noun *šrrt,* "happiness, prosperity."[12] In Jewish Aramaic the peal of the verb means "be firmly shut," the pael "make firm," and the ithpeal "become firm."[13] The adj. *šarîrā'* means "firm."[14]

In Syriac the vb. *šr* means "be healthy, solid," in the peal, and in the pael "strengthen." Besides the adj. *šarrîr,* "solid, intact, healthy," we also find a noun *šᵉrārā',* "truth, fidelity."[15] Other East Aramaic instances appear in Mandaic: *šrr,* "be solid, strong"; *šarir,* "strong, powerful, solid"; *šrara,* "truth, fidelity, solidity, good

---

šᵉrirûṯ. L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 247-87, esp. 283; A. B. Spencer, "שׁרירות as Self-Reliance," *JBL* 100 (1981) 247-48.

1. *HAL,* II, 1657-58.
2. *KTU* 1.19, II, 36; 1.24, 36; 2.46, 14; *UT,* no. 2491; *WUS,* no. 2691.
3. M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, *UF* 7 (1975) 207.
4. B. Margalit, *UF* 15 (1983) 113.
5. *KTU* 1.24, 36.
6. Dijkstra and de Moor.
7. *AHw,* III, 1190.
8. *AHw,* III, 1286; cf. H. P. Adler, *Das Akkadische des König, Tušratta von Mitanni. AOAT* 201 (1976), 327: "firm, in order" < *šrr* I.
9. *AHw,* III, 1285.
10. A. Salonen, *AfO* 19 (1959/60) 159.
11. *AP,* 314.
12. *DISO,* 321.
13. *ANH*³, 436.
14. Ibid., 435.
15. *LexSyr,* 802-3.
16. *MdD,* 446, 457-58.

health."[16] This semantic breadth is maintained in the later occurrences, e.g., Palmyr. *šrr* aphel, "decide, determine,"[17] aphel passive, "be approved, countersigned."[18] A noun *šrrn'*, "our steadfastness, fidelity," is also found in Nabatean.[19] We may also mention Eth. *šārara*, "establish,"[20] with the adj. *šurūr/šᵉrūr*, "established, firm."

The presence of this root in Arabic is uncertain. Arab. *šarr(un)*, "evil,"[21] might be explained as an oppositional form. Kopf notes Arab. *sirr/sirrīya*, "secret, heart, interior."[22] Since several OT texts use *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* in parallel with such terms as *mô'ēṣôṯ*, "advice, plans," and *maḥšᵉḇôṯ*, "plans, devices," it may take on a synonymous sense, analogous to that of *ta'ᵃlumôṯ lēḇ*, "whisperings of the heart" (Ps. 44:22[Eng. 21]). On the basis of this evidence, Kopf proposes reading *šᵉrirôṯ* (pl.). This suggestion should not simply be rejected out of hand, since many translations in the LXX also point in this direction.[23] Furthermore, what may be the earliest instance of *šᵉrirûṯ* in the OT, Dt. 29:18(19), suggests understanding the word in the sense of "one's own resolve."[24] The term does in fact cover the semantic spectrum from willfulness to obstinacy.[25]

2. *Nouns.* Whether the noun *šārîr*, "sinew, muscle," derives from this verbal root is uncertain at best.[26] The meaning of the hapax legomenon in Job 40:16 *(šᵉrîrê biṭnô)* can be determined with some precision only on the basis of this derivation, since its only known cognate is Tigr. *šer*, "muscle,"[27] and the LXX, Vg., and Tg. understood the text differently.[28] Only the interpretation of the Syr. (*wazqīpīn gᵉyādē dᵉpuḥdāw*, "and the sinews of its loins stand upright") points in the same direction.[29]

Outside the OT the noun *šᵉrîrûṯ* is also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The SP, too, uses this noun. In Jewish Aramaic, *šᵉrîrûṯā'* means "truth"; in Syriac, *šarīrūtā'* means "firmness."

The interpretation of the PN *šārār* in 2 S. 23:33 as a derivative of *šrr* I is quite uncertain,[30] especially since the parallel in 1 Ch. 11:35 reads *śāḵār*.[31] It is not out of the question that the father of one of David's thirty warriors should bear a name meaning

---

17. *DISO*, 320-21.
18. *DISO*, 321.
19. J. Naveh, *IEJ* 29 (1979) 112, l. 2.
20. *LexLingAeth*, 238.
21. Wehr, 461.
22. Cf. Wehr, 404-5.
23. See III.1 below.
24. See below.
25. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (1972, repr. Winona Lake, 1992), 105-6.
26. Cf. *BLe*, §61nα.
27. Leslau, *Contributions*, 55.
28. *HAL*, II, 1655; A. Guillaume, *AbrN* 3 (1961/62) 1-10, esp. 9.
29. For a discussion of the versions see E. Dhorme, *Job* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1967), 620.
30. *BLe*, §61q″.
31. *IPN*, 260.

something like "the healthy one." Such an interpretation gains support from the occurrence of similar PNs in Akkadian[32] and Egyptian, e.g., "(S)he will be healthy."[33]

II. OT.

1. *Lexical Field.* On etymological grounds,[34] the expression *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* is generally translated "hardness of heart." Kopf proposes to read it as a plural, *šᵉrirôṯ lēḇ,* in the sense of "insinuations of the heart";[35] Spencer believes that the expression refers primarily to (treacherous) self-reliance. Thus *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* exhibits a semantic ambivalence: for the individual in question, steadfast constancy; for the relationship between the individual and God, obstinacy.

Thus *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* belongs within the more limited sphere of obstinacy terminology;[36] it is more or less synonymous with such expressions as *sᵉḡôr lēḇ,* "sealing of the heart" (Hos. 13:8), *qᵉšê lēḇ,* "stubbornness,"[37] *tarmîṯ lēḇ,* "deception of the heart," and *nôḵaḥ pānîm,* "willfulness."

2. *Formal Observations.* The evidence of OT usage is striking: the noun *šᵉrirûṯ* (plene *šᵉrîrûṯ* only in Jer. 11:8 and Ps. 81:13[12]) occurs only 10 times, within a very limited body of texts: Dt. 29:18(19); Jer. 3:17; 7:24; 9:13; 11:8; 13:10(9); 16:12; 18:12; 23:17(16); Ps. 81:13(12). It is always associated with → לֵב *lēḇ* + suf.,[38] never with *lēḇāḇ.* It is usually accompanied by the vb. *hlk* (Jer. 18:12, *'śh;* Ps. 81:13[12], *šlḥ*). Its frequent association with the exodus motif is noteworthy (cf. also CD 3:5). This stereotyped formula has led Thiel to speak of a "stubbornness formula," set with few exceptions in the prophets' indictments of their own people.[39] This "stereotype" nevertheless exhibits a clear variability, which at least leaves open to question Thiel's posited diachronic leveling of most of the texts.

The following syntactic and stylistic forms may be distinguished:

hālaḵ bišrirûṯ lēḇ + suf. (Dt. 29:18; Jer. 13:10; 23:17);
hālaḵ bišrirûṯ lēḇ + suf. + *hārā'* (Jer. 7:24; 11:8);
hālaḵ 'aḥᵃrê šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ + suf. (Jer. 9:13[14]; 16:12).

In Jer. 3:17 there is clearly a hybrid form: *hālaḵ 'aḥᵃrê šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* + suf. + *hārā'.* Since this text also appears in a different genre (oracle of salvation instead of a threat) and is the only instance that refers to the nations *(gôyim)* rather than Israel/Judah, it is plainly

32. *AN,* 248-49.

33. Ranke, *PN,* I, 14, no. 22; 15, no. 12. For further discussion see *HAL,* II, 1658.

34. See I.1 above.

35. See I.2 above.

36. F. Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im AT. BZAW* 74 (1955).

37. → XIII, 189-95, esp. 192-93.

38. *GesB,* 864; *KBL²,* 1012.

39. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 122-23.

a special case. The invective in Jer. 18:12 *(ʾîš š^erirûṯ libbô-hārāʿ naʿ^aśeh)* and the indictment in Ps. 81:13(12) *(ʾ^ašall^eḥēhû* [subj.: God] *bišrîrûṯ libbām)* diverge syntactically from the formulaic language.

3. *Theology.* The formal differentiation argues for a diachronic differentiation, which must be supported by detailed literary analysis.

Dt. 29:18(19) can probably be dated in the late preexilic period, since vv. 1-20 constitute the core of ch. 19.[40] In the context of a ceremonial oath, every Israelite must swear wholeheartedly before God, without covert reservations, to renounce idolatry and not walk "with a stubborn heart." Since no one describes his or her own conduct as issuing from a "stubborn heart," the interpretation of the EÜ is plausible: the actions of individuals are to revolve totally around obedience to the covenant, for acting "on one's own initiative" (EÜ) puts the existence of the entire community at risk.[41] (The same idiom appears in 1QS 2:14. The MT is also supported by 4Q5 12-13 1:7;[42] the question remains open in the case of 4Q30 51.)

Jer. 23:17 clearly incorporates the formula used in Dt. 29:18(19). The threat concerns the false prophets, who even encourage those who follow the "desires of their own hearts" (cf. EÜ) and despise the word of Yahweh. Since this text makes no explicit reference to idolatry, McKane cautions against categorizing it uncritically as Dtr.[43]

Jer. 13:10 pronounces an indictment on the people in almost identical words. The typically Dtr accusations of refusing to hear God's words and going after other gods appear in parallel with "stubbornness of heart," clearly indicating Dtr redaction. The LXX, however, offers no equivalent to the stubbornness formula in our text.[44] Since 4Q70 (Jer[a])[45] also omits this text, it is possible that we have here a late interpolation in Dtr style into the proto-MT, echoing Dt. 29:18(19).

In Jer. 7:24 and 11:8 the "stubbornness formula" is expanded by the explicit addition of *hārāʿ* to qualify *lēḇ.* Both texts can be assigned with certainty to the same (exilic?) redactor, since the parallel expressions "refusing to hear God's voice" and "refusing to incline their ears" are identical. In 7:24 the formula has been expanded once more by the addition of the gloss *b^emōʿēṣôṯ* (not in LXX; cf. Ps. 81:13[12]). Since the LXX and 4Q70 also omit the text of 11:8,[46] here too we may be dealing with a very late expansion of the text. Thiel, however, prefers to ascribe the shorter LXX text to corruption due to homoioteleuton or to deliberate omission.[47] But the contradiction between vv. 7-8 and v. 11 entitles us to consider vv. 7-8 a secondary addition, at least literarily.

---

40. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium. NEB,* 2 vols. (1986-92), I, 211; for a different view see D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 146-54, 158-59: late Dtr, having much in common with the Dtr redactor of Jeremiah.

41. P. C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy. NICOT* (1976), 358-59.

42. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1. DJD,* I (1955), 59.

43. W. McKane, *Jeremiah. ICC,* 2 vols. (1986-96), I, 579; contra Thiel.

44. McKane, *Jeremiah,* I, 291.

45. J. G. Janzen, *Studies on the Text of Jeremiah. HSM* 6 (1973), 173-84.

46. See the discussion of 13:10 above.

47. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 148.

This addition emphasizes that, despite the serious and persistent warnings of the prophets, the people not only kept turning their backs on Yahweh but remained fundamentally defiant in their stubbornness.

Jer. 9:13(14) and 16:12 diverge from the diction of the preceding texts, using *hālaḵ 'aḥᵃrê* instead of *hālaḵ bᵉ*. Since this form of expression appears only in the prose sections of the book of Jeremiah, some scholars ascribe it to the prophet himself.[48] This hypothesis is hardly likely, however,[49] since here too the context draws extensively from the register of Dtr indictments. The stubbornness formula undoubtedly serves to aggravate the indictment: it states clearly that apostasy from God is not a casual error of the moment but has been Israel's disposition for generations. Here lies the answer to the question why Yahweh has brought disaster upon Israel.

In Jer. 3:17 a post-Dtr redactor borrows this form of expression and also qualifies *lēḇ* by adding *hārā'*. In a departure from normal Dtr usage, the formula appears in an oracle of salvation, which is addressed to the nations *(gôyim)*:[50] they will renounce their wicked stubbornness and take part in the universal pilgrimage to Jerusalem. It is interesting that this passage applies to the nations a concept used elsewhere only in condemnation of Israel. "They too are included in Yahweh's plan and purpose."[51] This passage appears to imply that this late redactor finds the Gentiles implicated in the *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ hārā'*. Renunciation of this stubbornness is the condition for entering into God's saving history alongside Israel.

In Jer. 18:12 the replacement of *hālaḵ* with *'āśâ* creates a syntactic problem in the formula, since *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* is now the direct object of *'āśâ* and loses its modal character. This radical shift from walking in *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* to doing *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* precludes assigning this text to the earlier Dtr and post-Dtr redactors. Since this formulation appears only here, it is difficult to place it in a literary context. The text (in the metaphor of God as potter) speaks of a call to repentance — wasted effort, since the people will continue to do *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ*. If this call to repentance is not a literary fiction, it seems reasonable to date it prior to the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E.; therefore it could have been uttered by Jeremiah himself.[52] This attribution to Jeremiah is supported by the fact that Jeremiah himself frequently calls on the people to repent and return;[53] the text brands doing *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* as the very opposite of repentance: it is stubborn, egotistical, insistent apostasy.

Ps. 81:13(12) also breaks out of the stereotyped "stubbornness formula," albeit not to the same degree as Jer. 18:12, while letting *šᵉrirûṯ lēḇ* retain its modal function. A prophetic oracle of judgment uttered in the setting of a festal liturgy charges the (postexilic) community with stubbornness. God had — and always has had — other

48. E.g., McKane, *Jeremiah,* I, 371.

49. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 136.

50. Contra C. F. Keil, *Jeremiah. KD,* I, 96.

51. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia. NEB,* 2 vols. (1981-84), I, 29.

52. J. Bright, *Jeremiah. AB* (1965), 125-26; for a different view see A. Weiser, *Jeremia I: 1–25,14. ATD* XX (⁶1969), 155.

53. → שׁוּב *šûḇ*.

In the OT the formula is usually embedded in indictments of the people; in the scrolls it appears primarily in admonitions. It expresses the fundamental theme in the basic stratum of the Manual of Discipline: the men of the community must not turn aside from the law to walk in the stubbornness of their own hearts (1QS 9:10). A convert wishing to enter the community must give up this stubbornness of heart as a fundamental condition for acceptance (1QS 1:6; 2:26 [= 4Q280 2 7]; 5:4 [= 4Q258 1 1:4]); conversely, *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* is grounds for temporary banishment from the community (1QS 7:19) or even excommunication, because *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* prevents justification (1QS 3:3 [= 4Q257 1 3:4]; 7:24). Here the community expands on the expression with a wide array of synonymous notions, above all when entrance into or conduct within the community is at issue.[60]

In the life of the community, stubbornness of heart, a predisposition toward egocentric thought *(maḥᵃšeḇeṯ yiṣrô),* stands in contrast to fidelity, harmony, humility, uprightness, justice, and compassionate love (1QS 5:4; 4Q258 1 1.4). Thus *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* is the absolute antithesis to life within the community. Therefore bitter curses are pronounced on those who outwardly enter into the covenant of the community while inwardly insisting ("blessing") that they will continue to walk in stubbornness of heart (1QS 2:14; cf. the discussion of Dt. 29:18[19] above). Converts who have entered the community and then turn their backs on it are equated by the Manual of Discipline with the worst sinners imaginable to the Qumran Essenes: traitors, false teachers, and idolaters.[61]

For the Damascus Document *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* is also a problem of Israel's history: *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* already led the heroes of ancient times to transgress (CD 2:17; cf. Gen. 6:1ff.); in their *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ,* the Israelites conspired against God's commandments (CD 3:5); all Israel forsook the first covenant and followed their own desires (3:11). Not to keep apart from the people, to be interested only in profit and possessions, to neglect the law — these are expressions of *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ;* one who acts thus is barred from access to the "house of the law" (8:8,19 [= 19:20,33]; 20:9). Such a way of life — since it keeps God at a distance — is ultimately idolatry (20:9; 1QH 4:15). Those who follow it are ruled by the angels of destruction and are seduced into falling away *(šwb)* (4Q390 1 12).[62] In 4Q266, a rule that probably antedates Qumran, a priest is disqualified and suspended from serving if he falls away from the truth in *šᵉrîrûṯ lēḇ* and disobeys the cultic regulations by eating of the holy things (4Q266 6 2:11).[63]

Fabry/van Meeteren

60. On 1QS 3:3 see H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur. BBB* 46 (1975), 302-4.

61. Ibid., 26-27.

62. D. Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha — 4Q390," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds., *Madrid Qumran Congress. STDJ* 11, 2 vols. (1992), II, 405-48.

63. J. Baumgarten, "The Disqualification of Priests in 4Q Fragments of the 'Damascus Document,'" in ibid., 503-13, esp. 506-9.

שֹׁרֶשׁ *šōreš;* שׁרשׁ *šrš*

I. Etymology: 1. Other Languages; 2. Origin of the Root; 3. Semantic Fields. II. Literal Meaning: 1. Lexical Field; 2. Meaning. III. OT Usage: 1. Literal; 2. Figurative. IV. Ancient Versions. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology.

1. *Other Languages.* a. *Akkadian.* Akk. *šuršu(m)* (Old Akk. *śurśum*)[1] denotes (1) the natural root of a plant, especially in rituals and recipes; (2) figuratively the foundations of mountains, buildings, and cities, especially in the destructive image of tearing out *(nasāḫu)* the roots of an enemy land; also of individuals, such as someone who breaks an oath; (3) in personal names, the paternal line, as in the alternative name *šuruš-kīn,* "The root is sturdy," i.e., the continuation of the paternal line (e.g., after the death of a son) is assured[2] (cf. also *išdu-kīnu*[3]). These meanings are also associated with the partial synonym *išdu(m),* "foundation, root."[4] Already in Sumerian we find the image of strengthening the foundations (*suḫuš,* Akk. *išdu* and *šuršu*[5]) of lands and thrones, as well as tearing out the foundations of enemies[6] like the roots *(úr)* of a tree.[7] Egyptian, too, speaks of tearing out the roots *(mny.t)* of the enemy.[8]

b. *Ugaritic.* Ugar. *šrš*[9] appears in a curse against a village *(mrrt tǵll bnr),* in a polar image of destruction; it means the "roots" of the village in the earth *(šršk bʾrṣ),* which are not to grow, alongside the "head" *(rīš)* or crown of the tree, which is to be torn out.[10] The noun also can denote a descendant; it appears in parallel with *bn,* "son," in the fulfillment of Danel's wish for children: "for a son was born to me *(kyld bn ly)* . . . a

šōreš. J. Becker, "Wurzel und Wurzelspross," *BZ* 20 (1976) 22-44; H. L. Ginsberg, "'Roots Below and Fruit Above' and Related Matters," in D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy, eds., *Hebrew and Semitic Studies. FS G. R. Driver* (Oxford, 1963), 72-76; C. Maurer, "ῥίζα," *TDNT,* VI, 985-91; A. E. Rüthy, "Die Pflanze und ihre Teile im biblisch-hebräischen Sprachgebrauch" (diss., Basel, 1942), esp. 44-46; R. Růžička, *Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen. BASS* VI.4 (1909), esp. 11-12, 179; H.-F. Weiss, "Wurzel," *BHHW,* III, 2193; J. A. Wharton, "Root," *IDB,* IV, 128.

1. *AHw,* III, 1286.
2. *AN,* 295, no. 3.
3. Contra Rüthy.
4. *AHw,* I, 393-94.
5. *AHw,* I, 393; III, 1286.
6. W. H. P. Römer, *Sumerische 'Könighymnen' der Isin-Zeit. DMOA* 13 (1965), 8-9, ll. 22-23; 232.
7. J. Krecher, *Sumerische Kultlyrik* (Wiesbaden, 1966), 168.
8. *WbÄS,* II, 77.
9. *WUS,* no. 2694.
10. *KTU* 1.19, III, 52-54.

descendant *(wšrš)*."[11] In this sense it is also found in personal names *(šrš'm, šur-ša-ammi);*[12] cf. also the toponym *šu-ra-šu/i/e.*[13]

c. *Phoenician.* In the Phoenician Eshmunazar inscription from Sidon,[14] the noun *šrš* appears in a curse against anyone who would violate the tomb, again in a polar image of destruction,[15] *šrš lmṭ//pr lm'l* — the offspring of the violator shall be without roots below and without fruit above. Finally, *šrš* stands for offspring in Lapethos III, 3,[16] and possibly in Lapethos II, 16.[17] The same usage is also possible in a disputed passage in the Karatepe Inscription:[18] *wp'l 'nk lšrš 'dny n'm,* "and I did good for the offspring of my lord [(?) Awarku/Urukki]."[19]

d. *South Semitic.* The OSA noun *šrs* (s_2rs_1), dissimilated from **srs*,[20] denotes the foundation of a building.[21] In one instance it may also mean "founding, beginning";[22] cf. Qatabanian *šrsm;* also the expression *bn šrsm 'd fr'm,* "from bottom to top."[23] In the causative stem, the verb refers figuratively to the "uprooting" of a building down to its foundations.[24] Arab. *širš,* "root," and its associated vb. *šrš* II, "take root," are phonetically unexpected in the light of Old South Arabic. It occurs only in modern Arabic[25] and is probably a secondary borrowing.[26] Arab. *širs* and *šaras,* a kind of low thorny undergrowth, are comparable.[27] Possibly related is the noun *sirr,* "interior, secret; root, foundation; source, beginning."[28]

In Soqotri we find the noun *śeraḥ,* "root," and the denominative vb. *śerḥ,* "uproot,"[29] from a base */šr/ (/śr/)* expanded by the addition of */ḥ/*.[30] In Geez the noun *śərw* (derived from the base */śr/*)[31] means both "base; root(stock); source, lineage" and "sinew, mus-

---

11. *KTU* 1.17, II, 15; cf. I, 19-20, 25; *TO,* I, 421; *CML*², 105; J. C. de Moor, *Nisaba* 16 (1987) 227.

12. D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th Centuries BC from Canaan and Syria. AOAT* 214 (1984), 276; *PNU,* 196.

13. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis,* 276.

14. *KAI* 14.11.

15. See I.1.b above.

16. A. M. Honeyman, *Mus* 51 (1938) 286.

17. *KAI* 43.16; a different reading in *TSSI,* III, 136-37.

18. *KAI* 26A.I.10.

19. F. Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe. PCRHP* 11 (1979), 22-23, 57; H.-P. Müller, *TUAT,* I, 641-42, with bibliog.; for a different interpretation see *KAI,* II, 36.

20. *VG,* I, §§57aβ, 85aα; cf. Růžička.

21. Beeston, 134-35; *RES,* VIII, 247-48; ContiRossini, 253.

22. R 4126, 2; Biella, 526-27.

23. S. D. Ricks, *Lexicon of Inscriptional Qatabanian. StPohl* 14 (1989), 172.

24. R 3945, 15-16; Biella, 526-27.

25. Wehr, 464.

26. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 535.

27. Lane, I/4, 1532; G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum,* II (Halle, 1830), 410; Leslau, *Contributions,* 55: not *šurs;* on the semantic development see I.2 below.

28. Wehr, 404-5; Lane, I/4, 1338; Freytag, II, 303; see I.2 below.

29. W. Leslau, *Lexique Soqotri* (Paris, 1938), 433; idem, *Contributions,* 20, 55.

30. See I.1 below and Leslau, *Lexique Soqotri,* 21-22.

31. See I.2 below.

cle, nerve."[32] The corresponding forms in the other Ethiopic dialects are biconsonantal with /s/:[33] *sər;* also *səret, səred.*[34] Also connected with the biconsonantal base /śr/ is the vb. *śārana/sārana,* "lay a foundation, found."[35] In Cushitic we find the biconsonantal noun *sər, ser, zir.*[36]

e. *Extrabiblical Hebrew.* In inscriptional Hebrew the noun *šrš* appears in the phrase *bšrš bqyhw,* "from the Buqqiyāhu clan," in an unclear passage in the Ophel ostracon, from the end of the 7th century B.C.E.[37] In the SP *šārəš* appears in Dt. 29:17(18).[38]

In Middle Hebrew the noun *šōreš* is used of trees and wheat.[39] Figurative usage describes the destruction of a tree by laying bare its roots and chopping them up.[40] The denominative verb has the privative meaning "uproot, exterminate" in the piel; in the hiphil it means "take root."[41] Besides serving as the passive equivalent to the piel, the hithpael and nithpael mean "take profit."[42]

f. *Aramaic.* In Old Aramaic curse formulas *šrš* refers to descendants, as in Sefire I.C.24-25: *w'l yrt šr[š]h 'šm,* "and his descendants shall have no name."[43] The noun may also occur in l. 28 of Zakir inscription B.[44]

Biblical Aram. *šᵉrōš* appears in Dnl. 4:12,20,23(Eng. 15,23,26);[45] in Jewish Aramaic we find *šuršā', šoršā' (šwrš'),* and *širšā',* "root."[46] In the aphel the verb means "take root"; in the pael, causatively "(cause to) take root" and privatively "uproot"; the pael also means "bring profit," and the ithpeal, intransitively, "be profitable (for)."[47]

The later Aramaic languages use both the noun (**širš:* Syr. *šeršā',* "root, foundation, beginning";[48] Mand. *širša,* also "lineage, family; source";[49] **šurš:* Christian Palestinian Aram. *šwrš', šrš'*[50]) and the denominative vb. *šrš* (Syr. aphel "take root," pael also "uproot"[51]; Mand. ethpael, "take root"[52]).

---

32. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez,* 535-36.
33. Ibid., xxv.
34. Ibid., 535.
35. Ibid., 535-36.
36. Ibid., 536.
37. *KAI* 190.1; cf. J. Renz, "Die althebräischen Inschriften I" (diss., Kiel, 1992), 270-72.
38. On the Dead Sea Scrolls see V below.
39. Jastrow, 1634-35.
40. Nu. Rab. 20.242a; *WTM,* IV, 615.
41. See I.3 below.
42. *B. Qam.* 67b-68a; Jastrow, 1635; but cf. *WTM,* IV, 615: "become rooted" — used of a thief who has become "rooted in sin."
43. *KAI* 222; *TSSI,* II, 34-35.
44. *KAI* 202B.28; *TSSI,* II, 12-13.
45. *LexLingAram,* 174; see also III.2.c.(2) below.
46. *ChW,* II, 520; Jastrow, 1635; Dead Sea Scrolls: Beyer, 719.
47. Jastrow, 1635; *TW,* II, 520.
48. *LexSyr,* 810; often also *'eqqārā'* (ibid., 543-44).
49. *MdD,* 463-64.
50. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (1903, repr. Tel Aviv, 1972), 216.
51. *CSD,* 599; cf. also *'qr* peal and pael, "uproot" (*CSD,* 425-26).
52. *MdD,* 476.

2. *Origin of the Root.* The fact that roots with identical first and third radicals are rare and mostly secondary derivatives (similar problems arise with the noun → **שֶׁמֶשׁ** *šemeš*), the variation of the third radical in individual languages in both the verb and the noun (Heb. *šrš,* Arab. *šrs,* Eth. *šrw,* Soq. *śeraḥ*), and semantic affinities with the roots *šrr* ("be firm"), *šrr, šrw* ("sinew," etc.), and possibly *šrr* (Arab. *sirr,* "interior, source"[53]) all lend credence to the theory of a common base /*ŠR*/ that has been expanded in various ways. Some of the instantiations in particular languages might be assigned as follows to the roots deriving from the biconsonantal base /*ŠR*/:

a. *šrš* ([?] *śrś*), "root."[54]

b. *šrr, šrw* ([?] *śrr, śrw*), "sinew, muscle": OT Heb. (?) **šārîr,*[55] Eth. *šərw;*[56] *šrr,* "navel, umbilical cord": Ugar. *šr,* Syr. šerrā', Mand. *šura,* Arab. *surr,* OT **šōr,*[57] Jewish Aram. *šôrā',* Middle Heb. *šārār.*[58]

c. *šrr* ([?] *śrr*), "be firm, etc.": Aram. *šrr* (cf. Egyptian Aram. *šryr, šrrt,*[59] Palmyrene, Jewish Aramaic, Samaritan Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic[60]), Eth. *śārara,* "establish," Soq. *śrr.*[61]

d. *šrr* in Arab. *sirr,* "something hidden, interior, source, etc."[62]

Still problematic is the postulate of a semantic development of Arab. *sirr,* "something hidden, interior," to "something hidden in the earth, root."[63] The earliest occurrences of *šrš* (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Old South Arabic, etc.) have the concrete meaning "root, foundation" and the figurative sense of "descendants"; the abstract meaning, found only in Arabic, appears to be a later development. Similarly, Arab. *šaras, širs* as the name of a plant, with the postulated meaning "gnarled,"[64] is more likely a secondary derivative from the basic meaning;[65] this meaning (more likely abstract) is also not found in the earlier sources.

Primarily, then, the base /*ŠR*/ in its various instantiations appears to have denoted that which lies beneath, something strong, stable, and fibrous or sinewy. It is not necessary to assume a general and therefore abstract "basic meaning," which is problematic in any case. Indeed, it would be necessary to assume several equally problematic "basic meanings"; later differentiation would seem more likely.

---

53. See I.1.d above.

54. See I.1 above.

55. *HAL,* II, 1655; Guillaume, part III, 9.

56. See I.1.d above.

57. *HAL,* 1650-51.

58. Jastrow, 1542, 1634.

59. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century* B.C. (Oxford, ²1957), 44; *DISO,* 320-21.

60. *HAL,* II, 1657-58.

61. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez,* 534-35. On the problem of categorizing the root in Ugaritic, see G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 585, 633; *HAL,* II, 1657. On Heb. → **שְׁרִרוּת** *šᵉrirûṯ* see L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959) 283.

62. See I.1.d above.

63. Růžička; similarly Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez,* 535: "source" > "root."

64. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez,* 535.

65. Contra F. Schwally, *ZDMG* 52 (1898) 140-41.

It must remain uncertain whether *šrš/šrs/šrw,* "root," derives from an originally reduplicated *šr-šr* ([?] *śr-śr*),[66] from which the fourth consonant was dropped, as in cases like *krkr* > *krk.* In any case roots with identical first and third radicals are rare and often derive from reduplicated roots.[67]

The precise nature of the first (and third) radical is also an unresolved question. Old Akkadian, Ethiopic, and Soqotri suggest *śr(ś)*[68] (although Old Akk. /ś/ does not reflect Common Sem. /ś/ in every case[69]), whereas Hebrew (/š/ instead of /ś/), Aramaic (esp. Syriac and Mandaic with /š/ instead of /s/), and dissimilated Arab. and OSA *šrs* < *srs* point instead to *šrš.*

The noun derived from the base **šurš* ([?] *śurś;* > Aram. **šiřš*[70]) is a primary noun; in every language the verb is denominative.

3. *Semantic Fields.* The primary noun denotes in the first instance a natural botanical root (Akkadian, Modern Arabic, Soqotri, Ethiopic, Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic); figuratively, destruction of the root means total destruction (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Middle Hebrew). Used with reference to inanimate objects, *šrš* stands for the foundations of mountains and buildings or cities (Akkadian, Old South Arabic, Syriac; cf. Ethiopic [base]; less commonly "beginning" [Syriac]; cf. Arab. *sirr,* Mand. *širša,* "source"). It can also stand for "ancestors, family, clan" or "descendants" (Ugaritic, Phoenician, Old Aramaic).

In the rare G stem the verb has the meaning "take root" (Ethiopic); the D stem usually has the privative denominative meaning "uproot" (Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Ethiopic; cf. Soq. *śerḥ,* Syriac pael; OT: Ps. 52:7[5]; Job 31:8,12; Sir. 6:3);[71] less often it has the causative sense "take root" (Modern Arabic, Jewish Aramaic). The causative stem[72] has the causative sense "produce roots, take root" (Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac; OT: Isa. 27:6; Ps. 80:10[9]; Job 5:3; cf. also the resultative poel/poal in Isa. 40:24; Jer. 12:2[73]). In Old South Arabic it also has the privative sense "uproot" (of buildings). In the passive stems it can also mean "become rooted" (Mandaic, Ethiopic; cf. Middle Hebrew hithpael).

II. Literal Meaning.

1. *Lexical Field.* We find *šōreš* in parallel with *yônēq,* "scion, shoot" (Isa. 53:2; cf. Hos. 14:6[5]); we also find it used with *nēṣer* (+ *min* + *šōreš*), "scion" (Isa. 11:1;

---

66. Růžička, 11; cf. already *GesTh,* 1483.

67. Růžička.

68. Also Beyer, 102.

69. S. Moscati et al., *Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (1969), 33; cf. *GaG,* §30a.

70. See *VG,* I, §52 lδ, for the later Aramaic dialects and 52a-c for Arabic.

71. *HP,* 274.

72. *GK,* §53g; also *HP,* 46-50: "internally transitive."

73. Meyer, II³, §72.1b.

raglay refers to soles that are branded is ruled out by the fact that the expression meaning "sole (of the foot)" is *kap hāregel; šōreš* as the "foundation of the foot" denotes what lies beneath the foot.[90] Further, in the OT slaves are branded on the hand or forehead; a brand on the sole of the foot would be invisible and pointless.[91]

The obscure text Job 36:30 probably also belongs here: *hēn-pāraś ʿālāyw ʾôrô wešoršê hayyām kissâ,* "Behold, he spreads his light upon it and covers the roots of the sea." The cosmological hymn in vv. 27-33 speaks first of rain in vv. 27-28, then in vv. 29-30 of the wonderful flight of the clouds (*miprese-ʿāb;* cf. Akk. *naprašu,* "flight"; or with several mss. and Job 37:16 *mplśy,* "floating"[92]) and the thunder (the "noise of his [Yahweh's] pavilion"; cf. Ps. 18:12[11][93]). The text of v. 30 has often been questioned. It speaks next of Yahweh's light above the dark storm clouds (cf. Ps. 18:13[12]).[94] Then v. 30b addresses the other extreme, the depths beneath the sea, which Yahweh reaches ([?] with his light) (cf. *qarqaʿ hayyām* [Am. 9:3]; *ḥēqer tehôm,* "bottom of the deep" [Job 38:16]).[95] In any case the text presents an image of clouds (floating above the sea) surrounded by Yahweh's dazzling light.

The evidence of Theodotion and LXX^{B} *(ēdō, ōdē)* has led many scholars to read *ʾēḏô* instead of *ʾôrô*.[96] Since the former translation of *ʾēḏ* as "mist" is now known to be wrong,[97] "his flood" does not represent an improvement over "his light." The prototype used by Theodotion and others may also have been influenced by *leʾēḏô* in v. 27. Without any support from the versions, many scholars have chosen to emend v. 30b to read *wrʾšy hrym,* "and (he covers) the mountain peaks," which is certainly the *lectio facilior.*[98]

Security and permanence can also be provided by the other function of roots: absorbing water. For example, Jer. 17:8 stands in a series of wisdom aphorisms (vv. 5-11) that compare one who trusts in Yahweh to a tree planted by the water, sending out its roots by the stream so as to withstand the heat, in contrast to one who trusts in mortals, who is like a shrub in the desert (v. 6; cf. Ps. 1:3). Job hoped (Job 29:18-20) for glory (v. 20) and lasting vitality on account of his righteousness: he is like the phoenix (v. 18), his roots are "open for water" *(pāṯûaḥ ʾelê-māyim);* the parallel line speaks of dew all night on his branches (v. 19).

The allegory in Ezk. 17 (*ḥîḏâ, māšāl,* v. 2) describes Zedekiah as a "seed from the land," a vine taken by the "eagle" (Babylon) and planted by abundant waters, that "its branches might turn to him and its roots remain under him" (*dālîyôṯāyw//šorāšāyw,* v. 6). But he turns to a second eagle, Egypt, to whom he trains his roots and branches

---

90. Cf. N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 224, 232; *HAL,* I, 347.

91. Clines, *Job,* 322.

92. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 480; and others.

93. For a different interpretation see Fohrer, *Hiob,* 478, 480.

94. Driver and Gray, *Job,* II, 283-84 — not lightning, as in NRSV and Habel, *Job,* 512.

95. See also H. Ringgren, → VI, 96.

96. Beginning with B. Duhm, *Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 175; cf. E. Dhorme, *Job* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1967), 555, who also cites the Tg.

97. *GesB*[18], 13.

98. Beginning with Duhm, *Hiob,* 175; cf. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 480.

(v. 7); he will therefore be uprooted (v. 9).[99] Similarly, 31:7 compares Pharaoh to a symbolic world tree ([?] reading *t'šwr* for *'šwr* in v. 3[100]) that is great and magnificent, *kî-hāyâ šoršô 'el-mayim rabbîm,* "for its roots go down to abundant water."

(2) Negatively, total annihilation can be represented by the destruction of roots, often expressed by the piel of *šrš*. In Job's oath of purgation he declares: "If . . . , then let me sow and another eat, let what grows for me be rooted out" (*w^e ṣe'^e ṣay y^e šōrāšû,* 31:8). Sir. 10:16 applies this image to the "arrogant" (reading *gē'îm* for *gôyîm* in vv. 15-16,[101] and [?] reading with LXX *wyšršm 'd qrq' 'rṣ,* "and uproots them to the foundations of the earth"[102]). In Ps. 52:7(5), similarly, the psalmist prays for his enemy to be broken down *(ntṣ),* struck down (*ḥth₂*[103]), torn from his tent *(nsḥ),* and finally "uprooted [*šrš* piel; LXX reads the nominal form *w^e šorš^e kā*] from the land of the living" (cf. also Ezk. 17:9bδ).

In Sir. 6:3 *šrš* piel has lost its concrete associations and is simply used in the figurative sense of "destroying" (fruit) (LXX *apoléseis;* Sir^Syr *tkwl*). Job 31:12 (MT) says the same of the fire that "destroys" all of Job's harvest,[104] unless *t^e šārēš* is emended to *tiśrōp̱.*[105]

Isa. 14:30 warns of the destruction of Philistia: the adder and seraph (v. 29)[106] will "strike the land mortally at the root with famine" ([?] reading *whmyt* for *whmtty*); in synthetic parallelism the verse goes on to threaten death to whatever survives.[107] Despite LXX *spérma* for *šrs,*[108] the passage is probably not thinking of the later descendants of Philistia,[109] in simple synonymous parallelism *(šrš = š'ryt).*[110] The verse addresses the immediate future (probably the successor of a just-deceased Assyrian king[111]), which affects the present generation. Later translators often interpreted *šrš* in the sense of descendants.[112]

Total destruction can also be represented by the merism of roots below and fruit or branches above, often found in prophetic threats. Isa. 5:24 uses *šōreš* together with *peraḥ;* the description of the coming day in Mal. 3:19(4:1), similar in wording, uses it together with *'ānāp̱,* "branch" (Tg. translates "son and grandson"[113]). Often *šōreš* par-

99. See III.2.a.(2) below.

100. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 141-42.

101. Cf. Sir^Syr and Smend, *Jesus Sirach,* 95; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira,* 222.

102. Smend, *Sirach,* 96; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira,* 222; for a different interpretation see Becker, 37-38.

103. G. R. Driver, *JTS* 32 (1931) 255.

104. Habel, *Job,* 423.

105. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 425; Duhm, *Hiob,* 147-48; and others.

106. See III.2.c.(3) below.

107. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997) 88, 97-98; see also H. Gese, *VT* 12 (1962) 436-37.

108. Becker, 29-30.

109. See III.2.c.(4) below.

110. As proposed by Becker, 29.

111. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 97; H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964), 110-13.

112. See IV below.

113. See IV below; W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 287.

there is a "root" among them "that brings forth poison and bitter wormwood" (metonym for a poisonous plant; cf. Heb. 12:15).

(2) Some images are dominated by the ability of a tree to regenerate even if it has been cut down to a stump.[126] Job 14:8 describes the impermanence of mortals in contrast to the permanence of a tree, which sprouts again even if it is cut down (v. 7); its roots grow old in the earth *('m-yzqyn b'rṣ šršw)* and die, but it regrows.[127] In like manner, the stump and roots *('iqqar šoršôhî)* of the tree Nebuchadnezzar will regrow after the tree is cut down (Dnl. 4:12,20,23[15,23,26]).

(3) By metonymy, *šōreš* can also mean "rootstock, ancestors."[128] In the context of an eschatological hymn, Isa. 11:1 foretells that the future ruler will be a descendant of David, "a shoot from the stump of Jesse" *(ḥōṭer miggēza' yišāy)* in parallel with "a branch from his roots" *(nēṣer miššorāšāyw)* ([?] reading *yipraḥ* for *yipreh*[129]). This is metaphorical language, but there may be echoes of the technical meaning "ancestors; family, clan" for *šōreš.*[130] The aspect of regeneration from a dead stump[131] probably plays a role as well, if a new beginning *(prḥ; gēza')* is envisioned after the fall of the current royal family.[132] The same image appears again in Dnl. 11:7: Ptolemy III, the brother of Berenice, will "rise up in his place as a branch from her [Berenice's] roots" (Ptolemy II, the father of Berenice and Ptolemy III) ([?] reading with LXX *nēṣer miššorāšeyhā* [LXX *ek tḗs rhízēs autoú*] *'al-kannô*[133] or MT *minnēṣer* with partitive *min* and *kannô* as an adverbial accusative[134]). Cf. also Tob. 5:14 (LXX).

In an oracle of disaster against the Philistines, Isa. 14:29 threatens that an "adder" *(ṣepa')* will come forth "from the root that is a snake" (*miššōreš nāḥāš* [epexegetical genitive][135]); the continuation makes its fruit a "flying seraph."[136] Depending on the antecedent of *ûpiryô,* the threat may have three elements (snake, adder, fiery serpent) or two (snake, adder/seraph).[137] In any case the text warns that a worse threat is coming than that now posed by an Assyrian ruler;[138] even if three elements are identified, however, the text does not necessarily refer to the next generation but one.[139]

---

126. On the phenomenon see Fohrer, *Hiob,* 256 n. 39; Dalman, *AuS,* IV (1935), 174-75, 181; also Isa. 6:13.

127. For Egyptian parallels see Fohrer, *Hiob,* 256.

128. For this usage in secular Greek see Maurer, 985.

129. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 461; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. tr. ²1983), 252, with references to the versions.

130. See above: I.1.e (Old Hebrew), I.1.a.(3) (Akkadian), I.1.d (Ethiopic), and I.1.f (Mandaic).

131. See III.2.c.(2) above.

132. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 470-71; cf. Mic. 5:1(2).

133. A. Bentzen, *Daniel. HAT* I/19 (²1952), 76; and others; cf. vv. 20-21.

134. J. A. Montgomery, *Daniel. ICC* (²1952), 428, 432; on the historical events see ibid., 428-31.

135. Meyer, §97.4c; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 96.

136. → שׂרף *śārap.*

137. Becker, 28.

138. See III.2.a.(2) above.

139. As claimed by Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 96-97.

Jgs. 5:14 is historically and textually problematic. If we assume that *minnî 'eprayim šoršām ba'amālēq* is parallel in construction to v. 14b,[140] it can be translated: "(There set out) some from Ephraim whose root [= origin] is in Amalek."[141] If so, this text, like Jgs. 12:15 MT,[142] refers to a group of people from Amalek residing in Ephraim.[143] If, on the other hand, the text means that Ephraim is rooted "in Amalek,"[144] but nevertheless (to its credit) participated in the battle,[145] we must assume that there was a region in Ephraim expressly called "Amalek" (contra Jgs. 12:15: *har hā'amālēqî*). But the simple term *b'mlq* would more likely suggest to the hearer *the* Amalek in the south, especially since *'mlq* is a South Semitic form, not Canaanite.[146] Other interpretations read the text negatively, chastising Ephraim for having "put down roots" at home instead of taking part in the battle.[147] Nowhere else, however, does the distinctly positive image of being rooted have this negative connotation.

Besides historical difficulties,[148] there are textual problems. The reference in Jgs. 12:15 is textually uncertain: the LXX (mss.) and Vetus Latina have *Sellēm* and *Ellen,* respectively;[149] the MT may have been influenced by 5:14.[150] In 5:14 LXX^A and Theod. read *en koládi = bā'ēmeq*[151] for *ba'amālēq,* probably a reference to the Valley of Jezreel.[152] For *šoršām* the versions offer a verb (LXX *etimōrēsato* and *exerrízōsen,* Vg. *delevit eos* [*šrš* piel]). Conjectural emendations include above all *śārîm,* "princes," for *šoršām.*[153] Some believe that the text cannot be reconstructed at all.[154]

(4) In Isa. 11:10 *šōreš* means "descendants": the nations will inquire of the "root of Jesse." This universalizing addition to vv. 1-9[155] picks up the image in v. 1;[156] it is now clearly a cliché, so that the "branch from the root of Jesse" can be shortened to *šōreš yišay.* V. 10 may be an abbreviated reference to v. 1; *šōreš* may also simply mean

140. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l/AT, I. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 85-86.

141. J. A. Soggin, *ZDPV* 98 (1982) 58-62.

142. See below.

143. On the settlement of Amalekite groups outside their sphere of influence, see G. L. Mattingly, "Amalek," *ABD,* I, 170.

144. See III.2.a.(1) above.

145. H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 44-46; Soggin, *ZDPV* 98 (1982) 59-60.

146. E. A. Knauf, *Bibl* 64 (1983) 428.

147. For a discussion see J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1981), 88.

148. Knauf, 428-29.

149. See *BHS.*

150. K. Budde, *Richter. KHC* VII (1897), 90; for a different view see Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle, I,* 85-86.

151. See *BHS.*

152. Soggin, *Judges,* 88; cf. NRSV.

153. Soggin, *Judges,* 88-89; for other proposals see U. Bechmann, *Das Deboralied zwischen Geschichte und Fiktion* (St. Ottilien, 1989), 66-67.

154. Becker, 23 n. 6; G. F. Moore, *Judges. ICC* (repr. 1910), 150-52.

155. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 482-83.

156. See III.2.c.(3) above.

"shoot, descendants."[157] This meaning becomes increasingly important in the post-OT period[158] (cf. Sir. 47:22 LXX; 1 Mc. 1:10 LXX; *rhíza Dauid* in Rev. 5:5 and 22:16; and *šōreš yišay* in early Jewish texts[159]). In Isa. 53:2 the meaning is clearly "shoot": the unprepossessing and vulnerable servant of Yahweh is likened to a *yônēq* and a root that grows up out of dry ground.

(5) From the meaning "ancestors" or (abstractly) "source"[160] derives the figurative sense of "cause." In Job 19:28 Job accuses his friends of trying to find the "cause of the matter" *(šōreš dāḇār),* i.e., of Job's suffering, in Job himself (reading *bô* instead of MT *bî* with many mss. and versions). Cf. Sir 1:20 LXX: "root of wisdom"//"beginning of wisdom" in v. 14; also Wis. 3:15: *rhíza tḗs phronḗseōs.*[161]

IV. Ancient Versions. The ancient non-Semitic versions usually translate the noun *šōreš* with *rhíza* (LXX) or *radix* (Vg.). Depending on what stem is used, the verb is usually paraphrased freely. The LXX is discussed below; the Vg. uses *eradicare* for the piel and pual, *radicare* or *radicem mittere* for the poel, etc., and *radices stabilire* for the hiphil in Ps. 80:10(9) (but the paraphrase *firma radice* in Job 5:3).

In the overwhelming majority of instances, the LXX translates *šōreš* with *rhíza; rhízōma* is used in Job 36:30, and Jgs. 5:14 translates with a verb.[162] The meaning "descendants," still rare in the OT,[163] is more common in the LXX. In Isa. 14:29-30 the LXX uses *spérma;*[164] in Isa. 27:6 it translates *šrš* hiphil with *tékna.*[165] In neither case does the translation fit the context of the MT.[166] The same tendency may be observed in the Tg. of Mal. 3:19(4:1)[167] and the LXX of Sir. 3:9, which undertakes to clarify the Hebrew text.[168] Isa. 11:1a LXX also translates *gēzaʿ* with *rhíza,* thus assuming the meaning "shoot, descendants."

The vb. *šrš* piel (privative) is paraphrased: *metanasteúein . . . kaí tó rhízōmá sou* (Ps. 52:7[5]), *apollýnai ek rhizṓn* (Job 31:12), and the pual is rendered freely: *árrizos gínesthai* (Job 31:8). For the hiphil we find *rhízan(s) bállein* or *kataphyteúein* (Job 5:3; Ps. 80:10[9]).[169] The poel and poal are both represented by *rhízousthai* (Isa. 40:24; Jer. 12:2).

---

157. See the Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Old Aramaic parallels discussed in 1.1.b-c,f above; also Becker, 27.

158. See the discussion of the versions in IV below.

159. Maurer, 988; Rom. 15:12.

160. See III.2.c.(3) above.

161. For the Dead Sea Scrolls see V below.

162. See III.2.c.(3) above.

163. See III.2.c.(4) above.

164. See III.2.a.(2) above.

165. See III.2.b.(3) above.

166. On Dt. 29:17 LXX (Eng. 18) see Maurer, 987; on 1 Esd. 8:75,84-85, see ibid., 986.

167. See III.2.a.(2) above.

168. See III.2.a.(1) above.

169. For Isa. 27:6 see above.

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1QH 3:31 *šwrš* refers to the roots of mountains[170] in the phrase *šwršy ḥlmyš,* "roots of rock"//*yswdy hrym,* "foundations of mountains" (cf. Job 28:9). Often we find the image of the tree of life (frequently identified with the Qumran community) that stretches forth its roots to the waters beneath the earth,[171] as in 1QH 6:16 *(thwm//nhrwt ʿdn);* 8:7,10,23 *(//gzʿ),* and possibly (Aramaic) 6Q8 2 1 *(tltt šršwhy).*[172]

The noun *š(w)rš* appears in a polar image of destruction[173] in 11QPs[a] 24:12-13 (Ps. 155) *(šwršyw//ʿlyw),*[174] with reference to the "evil scourge" (l. 12). An image of destruction also appears in a leprosy *tôrâ* concerning ringworm of the head or beard: its appearance is compared to "a plant attacked by a worm that destroys its roots and dries up its bloom" (4Q266 9 1:8).

The root that brings forth poison and bitter wormwood mentioned in Dt. 29:17(18)[175] reappears in 1QH 4:14 ([?] cf. also 4Q511 71 3[176]).

Finally, descendants are referred to in CD 1:7, which calls the community of the covenant *šwrš mṭʿt,* "shoot of the planting" that sprouts from Israel and Aaron.[177]

As in Sir. 1:20 (LXX) and Wis. 3:15,[178] wisdom texts speak of the "root(s) of wisdom/understanding" *(šwrš[y] ḥkmh/bynh),* which are unrecognized (4Q300 1 2:3) but should be sought out (4Q301 1 1:3; 2:1) and followed (4Q418 55 9; cf. also 4Q298 1 2:1). One should also strive for a deeper understanding of the roots of evil *(ʿwlh; rʿ)* (4Q416 2 3:14//4Q418 9 15; 4Q418 278 3).

Renz

170. See III.2.a.(1) above.
171. See III.2.a.(1) above.
172. M. Baillet, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân. DJD,* III (1962), 117.
173. See III.2.a.(2) above.
174. J. A. Sanders, *DJD,* The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11. IV (1965), 45, 70-71.
175. See III.2.c.(1) above.
176. M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III. DJD,* VII (1982), 251.
177. See III.2.c.(4) above.
178. See III.2.c.(4) above.

שׁרת *šrt*

I. 1. Meaning, Occurrences, Etymology; 2. Distribution. II. Usage: 1. Servants of Men of God; 2. Servants of Kings; 3. Servants of God; 4. Servants of the Cult. III. LXX. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Meaning, Occurrences, Etymology.* The root *šrt* has the basic meaning "serve"; often it has the more specific sense "do cultic service, serve as a priest." Westermann[1] holds that the word denotes primarily service to a person; Sedlmeier[2] believes that a "public" dimension is always present in the service performed.

šrt. R. Abba, "Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy," *VT* 27 (1977) 257-67; idem, "Priests and Levites in Ezekiel," *VT* 28 (1978) 1-9; S. Amsler, "עמד *ʿmd* to stand," *TLOT,* II, 921-24; H. Bauer, "Kanaanäische Miszellen," *ZDMG* 71 (1917) 410-13; G. Bertram, "ἔργον," *TDNT,* II, 635-55; A. Caquot, "Le service des anges," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 421-29; R. Carmond, "Nota sobre el vocabulario sacerdotal en el Targum palestinense," *Cuadernos biblicos* 4 (1980) 71-74; A. Cody, "Aaron/Aaronitisches Priestertum I. Im AT," *TRE,* I, 1-5; idem, *History of OT Priesthood. AnBibl* 35 (1969); M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 364-65; G. H. Davies, "Minister in the OT," *IDB,* III, 385-86; K. Engelken, *Frauen im Alten Israel. BWANT* 130 (1990), esp. 7-9, 35-37; M. Grumm, "Ministry: The OT Background," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 16 (1989) 104-7; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester. FRLANT* 89 (1965); M. Heltzer, *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit* (Wiesbaden, 1982); A. Lemaire, "Les inscriptions de Khirbet el-Qôm et l'ashérah de YHWH," *RB* 84 (1977) 595-608; B. A. Levine, "Later Sources of the Netînîm," in H. Hoffner, ed., *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 101-7; idem, "The Netînîm," *JBL* 82 (1963) 207-12; T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials. CBOT* 5 (1971); J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I: The Encroacher and the Levites. The Term ʿAboda. UCP, Near Eastern Studies* 14 (1970); S. Mittmann, "Die Grabinschrift des Sängers Uriahu," *ZDPV* 97 (1981) 139-52, esp. 144; K. Möhlenbrink, "Josua im Pentateuch," *ZAW* 59 (1942/43) 14-58; M. J. Mulder, "Versuch zur Deutung von *SOKÈNÈT* in 1. Kön. I 2,4," *VT* 22 (1972) 43-54; F. Perles, "Ein übersehenes Lehnwort aus dem Akkadischen," *OLZ* 22 (1919) 111-12; T. Polk, "The Levites in the Davidic-Solomonic Empire," *StBTh* 9 (1979) 3-22; G. N. Reeves, "שׁרת in the Pre-Christian Hebrew Literature" (diss., Southern California, 1969); K. H. Rengstorf, "δοῦλος," *TDNT,* II, 261-80; U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985); G. Sauer, "שׁמר *šmr* to watch, guard, keep," *TLOT,* III, 1380-84; H. Schulz, *Leviten im vorstaatlichen Israel und im Mittleren Osten* (Munich, 1987); F. Sedlmeier, *Studien zu Komposition und Theologie von Ezechiel 20. SBB* 21 (1990), esp. 321-37; H. Seebass, "Elisa," *TRE,* IX, 506-9; idem, "Levi/Leviten," *TRE,* XXI, 36-40; J. A. Soggin, "משׁל *mšl* to rule," *TLOT,* II, 689-91; H.-P. Stähli, *Knabe-Jüngling-Knecht. BEvT* 7 (1978); H. Strathmann, "λατρεύω," *TDNT,* IV, 58-65; idem and R. Meyer, "λειτουργέω," *TDNT,* IV, 215-31; W. Thiel, "Sprachliche und thematische Gemeinsamkeiten nordisraelitischer Prophetenüberlieferungen," in J. Zmijewski, ed., *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung. FS J. Reinelt* (Stuttgart, 1990), 359-76; J. P. Weinberg, "Die soziale Gruppe im Weltbild des Chronisten," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 72-95; C. Westermann, "שׁרת *šrt* pi. to serve," *TLOT,* III, 1405-7; A. S. van der Woude, "צבא *ṣābāʾ* army," *TLOT,* II, 1039-46; J. Zandee, "Das AT im Lichte der Ägyptologie," *Vruchten van de uithof. FS H. A. Brongers* (Utrecht, 1974), 145-57.

1. P. 1406.
2. Pp. 321-37.

It is only in Hebrew that the base appears with certainty as a verb. Opinions differ as to its occurrences in Ugaritic. Gordon[3] analyzes the form *šrd* in *šrd bʿl bdbḥk*[4] and *šrd bʿl bdbḥh*[5] as a Š stem of *yrd*, "go down," translating it as "present (with offerings)," i.e., "how a worshiper brings a god down to himself." Aistleitner instead considers the form a D stem of a root *šrd*, meaning "serve, pay homage to."[6] Also uncertain is the reading *ṯrt*, "service," for *ṯkt*.[7] Whitaker[8] lists a separate root *šrt*, for which he cites two lists of persons.[9] The forms *šrt/šrtm* in these lists are interpreted by Eissfeldt[10] and Virolleaud[11] as female singers (< *šîr*[12]).

Nominal derivatives include Jewish Aram. *šêrûṯ/šêrûṯāʾ*, "service,"[13] and Phoen. *mšrt*, "serve, perform rites."[14] The latter appears in a coronal inscription dating from 96 C.E.,[15] which honors the head of a Sidonian religious community for his additions to the courtyard of the house of God and for performing the services expected of him. According to Mittmann, inscription no. 3 from tomb II at Khirbet el-Qom in Iron Age Palestine contains an additional instance of *šrt*. While Lemaire finds in this inscription evidence of "worship of Asherah as Yahweh's hypostatic coadjutor in the heartland of Judah during the eighth century,"[16] Mittmann reads the third line of the text differently: *wmmṣr ydh lʾl šrth hwšʿ lh*, "and from affliction he praises the god of his service, who helps him."[17] The use of the root *šrt* to refer to this "service" leads Mittmann to ascribe the inscription to a temple singer named Uriahu, "although it must remain an open question whether he performed this service at the royal temple in the capital city of Jerusalem or in a rural sanctuary such as Khirbet el-Qom."[18]

Concerning the etymology of *šrt*, there are theories but no proofs. Perles proposes that it is an Akkadian loanword, a denominative from *šarrûtu*, "kingship," with the basic meaning "serve the king," after the analogy of Aram. *šammēs*, "serve," a denominative from *šmš*. He also points out that *arad-šarrûti* and *amat-šarrûti*, "royal slave (male and female)," are common legal expressions. More frequently mentioned is the theory

3. *UT*, no. 1150; also *CML*, 31, 33, 166.
4. *KTU* 1.14, II, 24-25.
5. *KTU* 1.14, IV, 6-7.
6. *WUS*, no. 2684; also A. Jirku, *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras Schamra-Ugarit* (Gütersloh, 1962), 87; J. Gray, *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra. DMOA* 5 (^{2}1964), 12, 38; G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 293; *TO*, I, 524 n. u (citing both possibilities); cf. R. Althann, *JNSL* 13 (1987) 3-9.
7. *KTU* 1.4, V, 7; see P. J. van Zijl, *Baal. AOAT* 10 (1972), 107, 110.
8. Whitaker, 611.
9. *PRU* V (1965), no. 80 (= RŠ 18.50) and 162 (= RŠ 18.250).
10. O. Eissfeldt, *SDAW, Klasse für Sprache* 8 (1965), 43.
11. C. Virolleaud, *PRU*, V (1965), 105, 193.
12. *WUS*, no. 2682.
13. *ANH*^{3}, 422.
14. *DISO*, 321.
15. *KAI* 60.4,8: "service, *leitourgía*" (date uncertain).
16. Cited by Mittmann, 139.
17. Ibid., 144.
18. Ibid., 147.

of Bauer,[19] who considers *šrt* a denominative from the name of the goddess Ashirtu/Ashratu or her temple, after the analogy of *šmš,* "serve in the temple of the sun."

2. *Distribution.* The occurrences of the word are distributed quite widely. Apart from conjectural forms, they total 98 (2 in Genesis, 10 in Exodus, 11 in Numbers, 5 in Deuteronomy, 1 in Joshua, 3 in 1 Samuel, 2 in 2 Samuel, 5 in 1 Kings, 3 in 2 Kings, 4 in Trito-Isaiah, 3 in Jeremiah,[20] 17 in Ezekiel, 3 in Joel, 3 in Psalms, 1 in Proverbs, 3 in Esther, 1 in Ezra, 2 in Nehemiah, 8 in 1 Chronicles, and 11 in 2 Chronicles). There are thus 28 occurrences in the Pentateuch, 27 in the Prophets, 22 in ChrH, 14 in DtrH, and 7 in Psalms, Proverbs, and Esther. In almost half the cases, the Levites are the subject; the focus of these texts is usually on the root. Strangely, *šrt* does not occur in the book of Leviticus, which deals at length with the functions and duties of Levites and priests. (Similarly striking is the almost total absence of *lēwî/lᵉwîyim:* of its 354 occurrences, only 4 are in Leviticus, in two verses [Lev. 25:32-33].[21]) Neither does *šrt* appear in Judges (according to Schulz,[22] Jgs. 17–20 is a "particularly valuable source of information about the Levites in premonarchic Israel" but does not use *šrt*), Proverbs, Deutero-Isaiah, the Minor Prophets (with the exception of Joel), or sapiential and hymnic poetry (with the minor exceptions listed above). The root occurs exclusively in the piel, with 3 instances of the perfect, 43 of the participle, 37 of the infinitive, and 13 of the imperfect. Nominal forms are rare; instead we find the nominalized ptcp. *mᵉšāreṯ* and the inf. *šārēṯ,* once (2 Ch. 24:14) in a construct phrase without the article and once (Nu. 4:12) with the article. There are only two instances of a feminine form (1 K. 1:15: 3d person sg. pf.; 1 K. 1:4: 3d person sg. impf. + suf.), referring to Abishag the Shunnamite, an attendant of King David.

II. Usage.

1. *Servants of Men of God.* The earliest occurrences of the root in the OT refer to disciples of elect men of God, who are destined to succeed their masters (Josh. 1:1-9; 1 S. 1–3; 1 K. 19:19-21; unintentionally in the case of Gehazi): Joshua, the disciple of Moses (Ex. 24:13; 33:11; Nu. 11:28; Josh. 1:1); Samuel, the disciple of Eli (1 S. 2:11,18; 3:1); Elisha, the disciple of Elijah (1 K. 19:21); and Gehazi, the disciple of Elisha (2 K. 4:43; 6:15). Except in 1 K. 19:21 (impf.[23]), the participle is always used as a functional designation, frequently in parallel with → נער *naʿar* (Ex. 33:11; 1 S. 2:11; 3:1 [cf. 2:21,26]; 2 K. 6:15 [cf. 4:12,25,38; 5:20,25 *ʿbd;* 8:4]). While the LXX uses forms of *leitourgéin* for all the occurrences in DtrH, in the four passages that refer to Joshua it uses three different Greek words: *paristánai, therapeúein,* and *hypourgeín.*

a. *Joshua.* According to an early tradition, only fragments of which are preserved,

19. P. 411; cf. Westermann, 1405; *HAL,* II, 1661-62.
20. On Jer. 15:11 see below.
21. D. Kellermann, → VII, 486; Seebass, "Levi/Leviten," 36.
22. P. 87.
23. See below.

further specified).[41] A *šrt* servant was clearly required to sever all previous human ties. It is impossible to decide with certainty whether Elisha was a wealthy property owner[42] or a member of an egalitarian agricultural association[43] before his call.

d. *Gehazi.* No information is given about the background of Gehazi, the motivation for his call, or his assumption of the legacy of his master (*'āḏôn,* 2 K. 5:25). He is characterized as a mediocre servant of Elisha (he is called *mᵉšārēṯ, na'ar,* and *'eḇeḏ*); his lack of charisma often makes him ineffectual. In contrast to Elisha, for example, he is incapable of raising the Shunammite's dead son even though he has his master's staff at his disposal (4:29-31). For deceiving his master, he is punished with leprosy (5:27). In contrast to the case of the previous *šrt* servants, there is no evidence that the appellation *mᵉšārēṯ* was intended as a mark of distinction.

2. *Servants of Kings.* The servants in 2 S. 13:17-18 (Amnon's servant), 1 K. 1:4,15 (David's personal attendant, who according to Mulder held a uniquely high position in the court; her title *sōḵeneṯ* characterizes her as enjoying certain of the privileges of a primary wife rather than being a → פִּלֶגֶשׁ *pilegeš*[44]), and possibly Gen. 39:4 (Joseph as the overseer of the pharaonic house; cf. Gen. 40:4, where he waits on the royal officers in prison) recall the personal servants discussed in the previous section. Elsewhere *šrt* functionaries belonging to the royal court are always spoken of in the plural; the word represents the title or duties of a body of officials. In the description of the magnificence of Solomon's court, 1 K. 10:5 (// 2 Ch. 9:4) mentions *šrt* servants immediately after *'ᵃḇāḏîm.* This sequence and the fact that the latter are described as sitting while the *šrt* servants stand (*'md*) may indicate hierarchical rank or may simply represent parallel formulation. Also relevant is v. 8, which macarizes the men and *'ᵃḇāḏîm* who stand before the king (*'md lip̄nê* describes the "posture of servants who stand before their masters and receive orders"[45]). It is a poor ruler who believes the falsehoods of his wicked *šrt* servants (Prov. 29:12). All *šrt* servants are expected to be trustworthy[46] and loyal (*tāmîm,* Ps. 101:6).

The other instances in ChrH have no parallel in DtrH; they all refer to non-Levitical military or administrative officers. Their mention (usually at the beginning or end of a list) serves as an inclusive term for four groups: (1) military officers (*śārîm*) commanding units of one thousand or one hundred, together with their *šōṭᵉrîm* (1 Ch. 27:1) (in Exodus–2 Kings the *šōṭᵉrîm* appear exclusively as premonarchic functionaries; their relationship is not with the king but with the people or the Israelites); Rüterswörden[47] explains their appearance in Chronicles as being due to the Chronicler's tendency to "disregard the differences between institutions under the monarchy and institutions

41. See also Thiel, 373.
42. Seebass, *TRE,* IX, 508.
43. De Vries, *1 Kings,* 239.
44. M. Häusl, *Abischag und Batscheba. ATS* 41 (1993), 239-44.
45. Amsler, 923.
46. → אמן *'mn;* H. Wildberger, *TLOT,* I, 138.
47. Pp. 109-10.

associated with premonarchic Israel or the individual tribes";[48] (2) officers of tribes or divisions (*śārê haššᵉḇāṭîm wᵉśārê hammaḥlᵉqôṯ,* 1 Ch. 28:1; LXX describes the *šrt* servants here as *tṓn perí tó sṓma toú basiléōs,* "personal servants"); (3) the Jerusalem garrison (2 Ch. 17:19);[49] and (4) the princes *(śārîm)* of Judah (2 Ch. 22:8). It is clear from these texts that the term refers to high-ranking officials. This holds true also for the individually named *šrt* servants at the court of the Persian king Artaxerxes, who are called *sārîsîm*[50] in Est. 1:10 and *nᵉʿārîm* in 2:2 and 6:3 (LXX does not reproduce the two titles). They are clearly distinct from the *śārîm* and *ʿᵃḇāḏîm* of 1:3 (all of whom are present at the king's great banquet). The commission to search for a new queen puts the *šrt* servants in the personal service of the king. They alone are called *diákonoi* by the LXX.

3. *Servants of God.* The vb. *šrt* is not used for the service of individual Israelites — except possibly in Rudolph's reading of Jer. 15:11: "Surely, Yahweh, I have served you with the best of intentions, I have intervened with you on behalf of the enemy in a time of trouble and in a time of distress"; in this interpretation the verse continues the prophet's complaint concerning his office.[51] Otherwise the term is reserved for the heavenly powers surrounding the throne of Yahweh, heavenly king and creator. In two hymns (Ps. 103:21; 104:4) God's *šrt* servants parallel the hosts of God's heavenly army *(kol-ṣᵉḇāʾāyw)* and God's messengers *(malʾāḵîm);* they are there to carry out God's will. In Ps. 104:4 the messengers are manifested as the winds, the *šrt* servants as blazing fire.

The theology of Trito-Isaiah includes the universal expectation that God will integrate all the peoples of the earth into his kingdom "and even choose 'priests and Levites' from among them without the legitimation of priestly descent."[52] Therefore Trito-Isaiah includes foreigners (kings, Isa. 56:6; 66:10) among God's future *šrt* servants. If they join themselves (*nilwâ*[53]) to Yahweh to be his *šrt* servants, to love his name, to be his *ʿᵃḇāḏîm,* to keep the Sabbaths and hold fast to the covenant, not only can they — like the eunuchs (56:3-5) — become fully recognized members (proselytes) of the congregation of Israel, they can even become priests of the congregation (vv. 6-8). This latter possibility is clear from the language of v. 6, which implies the usual marks of priestly service.[54]

Uniquely, animals are the subject of *šrt* in Isa. 60:7 (*BHS* therefore proposes deleting *yᵉšārᵉṯûneḵ* as a doublet from v. 10): they will offer sacrificial service when the new Jerusalem is established. Also unique is Ezk. 20:32. Normally Ezekiel limits *šrt* to priestly service, but here the word refers to the pagan worship of wood and stone by Is-

48. Cf. *HAL,* II, 1475-76.
49. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 251, 253.
50. → סריס *sārîs.*
51. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 104.
52. W. H. Schmidt, *OT Intro.* (Eng. tr. ²1995), 269.
53. → לוה I *lāwâ* I.
54. See II.4 below.

rael's ancestors. In the context of the summary of Israel's history in vv. 1-26, the verse may well refer to the patriarchs, among whom there were as yet no institutional priests. For this very reason Ezekiel may have viewed their *šrt* service as not being directed to the true God.

4. *Servants of the Cult.* In the late period *šrt* is always associated with the cultic sphere, although echoes of "personal service" can sometimes still be heard. Both priests and (much more commonly) Levites are referred to as *šrt* servants. In each instance the position of the cultic *šrt* servants depends on the structure of the postexilic community envisioned by the particular context (DtrH, P, Ezekiel, ChrH).

a. *DtrH.* The Dtr program expects all priests to be Levites. These texts therefore presuppose equality of the cultic functionaries resident at the central sanctuary and those coming from elsewhere as pilgrims.[55] As required by the Dtn law governing the priesthood (Dt. 18:1-8), both groups are authorized to offer *šrt* service there. The nature of this service is not immediately evident from the text. In v. 5b *lᵉšārēṯ* ("to serve"; NRSV "minister") is preceded immediately by *laʿᵃmōḏ* ("to stand"), which is often interpreted in the sense of the formula *ʿāmaḏ lip̄nê yhwh* ("stand before Yahweh"), common in Dtn/Dtr texts, which also appears in v. 7b (LXX uses the complete formula in v. 5b and also includes the function of blessing, as in the MT of Dt. 10:8). Because of the close relationship between the vbs. → קרב *qāraḇ* ("approach") and → עבד *ʿāḇaḏ* ("serve"), some see this as a reference to cultic functions.[56] According to v. 5a, admission to *šrt* service is the result of Yahweh's choosing[57] the tribe of Levi; it instantiates the special relationship of the Levitical priests to God. This relationship also finds expression in Dt. 10:8, where four infinitive phrases explicate the setting apart[58] of Levi: the Levites alone are to carry the ark of the covenant, they are to stand before Yahweh, offer him *šrt* service, and bless in his name forever.

Dt. 17:12 and 21:5 assign juridical functions to Levites in *šrt* service. Quite apart from the question whether Levites also served as judges, the contexts of Dt. 17:12 (establishment of an authority to give counsel in difficult cases, which would put the Levites in competition with other judges)[59] and 21:5 (ceremonial to be followed in the case of murder by an unknown hand, in which the Levites merely stand by as extras)[60] suggest that they are secondary additions. According to 1 K. 8:11//2 Ch. 5:14, the priests could not carry out their *šrt* service when the glory of Yahweh filled the temple.

b. *P.* In P the primary emphasis is again on the personal service performed for a superior by an inferior, as in the earlier texts. According to Gunneweg,[61] the victory of the theory, formulated in Dtr texts, that all priests are to be Levites, whereas in reality

---

55. Gunneweg, 126-38.
56. Amsler, 923-24; H. Ringgren, → XI, 182.
57. → בחר *bāḥar.*
58. → בדל *bdl* hiphil.
59. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1966), 117-18.
60. Ibid., 136.
61. P. 139.

not all Levites could serve in the temple, led to a postexilic division of the priesthood into two classes: only the Aaronides (of Levitical descent) constitute the official Jerusalem priesthood, while the Levites served as minor clerics, performing nonpriestly cultic duties. In this role the Levites are clearly subordinate to the priests, to whom they offer *šrt* service.

This distinction is clearest when God instructs Moses to set the tribe of Levi before Aaron *(wᵉhaʿᵃmadtā ʾōṯô lip̄nê)* to offer him *šrt* service (Nu. 3:6; cf. also 18:2). Even though Aaron clearly stands vicariously for the entire legitimate priesthood, the focus on the single individual is striking and may be influenced by the use of *šrt*. The impression of substantial dependence and subordination is strengthened by 3:9, which refers to the Levites as *nᵉṯûnîm* for Aaron (cf. also 18:6: "temple slaves, bound to the temple";[62] these appear alongside the Levites in lists of minor cultic personnel [Ezr. 2:43,58,70; Neh. 7:46,60,72; cf. also Ezr. 8:17]). Their duty as *šrt* servants is not to perform cultic functions but to "tend" the tent of meeting and its equipment (Nu. 1:50; [3:8]; 3:31; 4:9,12,14; 8:26; 16:9; 18:2ff.). Thus the Levites are assigned functions that were no longer performed in the time of P, since the desert sanctuary had long since lost its significance for Israel.[63] This anachronism is clearly not accidental; it signals that P is interested primarily in the priests but cannot ignore the Levites (and possibly does not want to[64]).

The subordinate nature of *šrt* service is also apparent in Nu. 8:23-26. From the age of 25 to the age of 50 (but cf. 4:2-4), the Levites are to carry out their duties in the tent of meeting *(yāḇô' liṣḇō' ṣāḇā' baʿᵃḇōḏaṯ 'ōhel mô'ēḏ)*. The root used here for carrying out duties *(ṣb')* does not denote a cultic activity (cf. 4:23-28) but rather service "performed not freely but because it is imposed from above"[65] (cf. Job 7:1; 10:17; 14:14; Isa. 40:2 [day labor and compulsory service]). After the age of 50, the Levites no longer carry out these duties but instead do *šrt* service for their brothers in the tent of meeting (Nu. 8:25-26) — *lišmōr mišmereṯ*, a form of service clearly distinguished by the text from the preceding activity (*ṣᵉḇā' ʿᵃḇōḏâ;* for *ʿᵃḇōḏâ* without *ṣāḇā'*, see 3:31 and 16:9). P frequently uses these words to describe the work of the Levites (in conjunction with *šrt:* 3:7,25; 18:3), which — probably because the basic meaning of *šmr* is "watch, guard"[66] — is interpreted as keeping watch in the temple.[67] Finally, the distance separating the Levites from the official priests finds its clearest expression in the fact that their status forbids them (upon pain of death) from approaching the holy of holies (Nu. 1:51; 18:3).

These findings are in conflict with several texts, all of which (with the exception of Ex. 30:20) relate to the vestments of the high priest Aaron and his sons when they per-

---

62. *HAL*, II, 732; → X, 105-7.
63. Noth, *Numbers*, 32-33.
64. Gunneweg, 223, speaks of P's "rehabilitation" of the Levites.
65. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 14; cf. also van der Woude, 1041-42.
66. *HAL*, II, 1582-83.
67. Sauer, 1383-84.

tion with the tent of meeting and their sole privilege of bearing the ark. According to 2 Ch. 8:14, the minor clergy perform this service, which includes praising and thanking God and singing, in the presence of the priests (cf. 31:2). In 23:6 Levitical *mᵉšārᵉṯîm* might be among the sacred priests who are permitted to enter the temple, if we follow Rudolph's reading, "those among the Levites who do service";[73] the LXX names three groups: *hoi hiereís kaí hoi Leuítai kaí hoi leitourgoúntes tṓn Leuitṓn.*

In 1 Ch. 23:13 and 2 Ch. 13:10 it is the sons of Aaron who are described as performing *šrt* service in their function as priests, which includes pronouncing blessings and offering incense. In 1 Ch. 26:12 the gatekeepers also perform *šrt* service (cf. Neh. 10:37-40). Finally, 2 Ch. 24:14 speaks of *kᵉlê šārēṯ,* cultic utensils of various sorts (cf. 2 K. 25:14; Jer. 52:18). The LXX uses *leitourgeín* or *leitourgía* to translate *šrt.*

e. *Joel.* Also postexilic are the four occurrences of the root in the book of Joel (1:9,13[bis]; 2:17), variations on the motif that the priests (no other group is mentioned) as *šrt* servants of Yahweh or the altar are to wail and lament because the cult (grain offerings and drink offerings) can no longer be carried out or because the people are threatened by God's imminent punishment.

f. *Summary.* Despite disagreements concerning the date of various texts, on the whole we observe a tendency of preexilic texts to use *šrt* with reference to individual service, whereas postexilic contexts tend to use it for a subordinate form of cultic service; but the latter connotation is not consistent. The root *šrt* differs from *ʿbd* in denoting a form of service that is highly specific and for the most part subordinate; by no means does it embrace the broad semantic spectrum of *ʿbd.*

III. LXX. In 80 percent of the cases the LXX uses *leitourgeín* to translate *šrt,* although it avoids this translation when referring to service outside the cult. For the latter it uses a variety of equivalents or paraphrases, often only once: *therápōn* (Ex. 33:11), *hypourgós* (Josh. 1:1), *proestēkóta* (2 S. 13:17), *pántes hoi hyp' autón* (Prov. 29:12), *tṓn perí tó sṓma toú basiléōs* (1 Ch. 28:1), *douleúein* (Isa. 56:6), and *hḗxousin.* Somewhat more frequent are *paristánai, diákonos/diakonía,* and *latreúein.*[74]

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. In describing the deployment of the community for worship during the war,[75] the War Scroll (1QM 2:1-3//4QM**ᵈ** 5) speaks of the fathers of the community, the chiefs of the divisions, and the chiefs of the Levites as *šrt* servants. The verb is also used for the deference that the defeated kings of foreign nations show toward Jerusalem (licking the dust of her feet?[76]) (1QM 12:14; 19:6//4QM**ᵇ** 1:6). The root is used figuratively to describe the exceptional relationship with God enjoyed by various mortals: outstanding heroes (1QM 13:3; 1QH 5:21), the community (?) (1QH 12:23), the righteous (1QH 15:24), priests (1QSb 4:25).

A unique instance in the Damascus Document speaks of an impersonal form of ser-

73. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher,* 270.

74. For a detailed presentation see Strathmann, 219-21.

75. Lohse, 294 n. 8.

76. See the various editions of the text.

vice: abstract entities such as discernment and knowledge *(ʿormâ wᵉḏaʿaṯ)* offer God *šrt* service (CD 2:4). Priestly service is referred to in the Temple Scroll (11QT 15:15; 32:12; 56:9 [Dt. 17:12]; 60:11,14 [Dt. 18:5,7]; 63:3 [Dt. 21:5]). Often, especially in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, the heavenly powers surrounding God are called "his servants" (sometimes in parallel with *ṣbʾ*, "hosts") (1QH 2:14; 4Q100 1 4,8; 4Q405 23 1:3; 2:2; 4Q511 35 4; cf. 4Q405 23 2:10; 11QShirShab 3-4 3). In 4Q378 22 1:2, echoing Josh. 1:1,[77] Joshua is called "servant *(šrt)* of your servant *(ʿbd)* Moses." Five additional instances appear in fragmentary contexts.

Engelken

77. See II.1.a above.

שָׁתָה *šāṯâ*; שקה *šqh*

I. Semitic: 1. General; 2. Individual Languages; 3. Common Features. II. OT: 1. Statistics; 2. Verbs; 3. Deverbal Nouns; 4. Thirst; 5. Semantic Pair. III. Pragmatics and Ethics: 1. Use and Abuse; 2. Nontheological Usage; 3. Abstract Objects; 4. Lady Wisdom. IV. Critical Situations: 1. The Exodus; 2. Ex. 24:11; 3. Individual Figures; 4. Selection; 5. Ps. 110:7a. V. Ritual Drinking: 1. Jealousy Ordeal; 2. Golden Calf. VI. Creation and History: 1. J's Creation Account; 2. The World; 3. New Exodus; 4. The Sanctuary; 5. The Law; 6. History. VII. Judgment and Salvation: 1. Signs; 2. Causes; 3. God as Author; 4. Yahweh's Judgment Feast; 5. Yahweh's Feast as Salvation for the Nations; 6. Yahweh's Cup; 7. Summary. VIII. Later Developments: 1. LXX; 2. Intertestamental Literature; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls.

šāṯâ. F. Bammel, *Das heilige Mahl im Glauben der Völker* (Gütersloh, 1950); C. T. Begg, "The Destruction of the Calf (Ex 32:20/Deut 9:21)," *BETL* 68 (1985) 208-51; J. Behm, "ἐσθίω," *TDNT*, II, 689-95; J. Bottéro and G. Steiner, "Getränke," *RLA*, III, 302-8; D. Bourguet, *Des métaphores des Jérémie. ÉtB. n.s.* 9 (1987); H. C. Brichto, "The Case of the ŚŌṬA and a Reconsideration of Biblical 'Law,'" *HUCA* 46 (1975) 55-70; idem, "The Worship of the Golden Calf," *HUCA* 54 (1983) 1-44; H. A. Brongers, "Zornesbecher," *OTS* 15 (1969) 177-92; H. Brunner, "Trunkenheit," *LexÄg*, VI, 773-77; A. Caquot, "Remarques sur le 'banquet des nations' en Esaïe 25,6-8," *RHPR* 69 (1989) 109-19; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 365-66; idem, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Syntax and Style," *UF* 1 (1969) 15-36, esp. 29, 34; A. de Guglielmo, "The Fertility of the Land in Messianic Prophecies," *CBQ* 19 (1957) 306-11; M. Delcor, "Le festin d'immoralité sur la montagne de Sion à l'ère eschatologique en Is 25,6-9 à la lumière de la littérature ugaritique," *Études bibliques et orientales des religions*

I. Semitic.

1. *General.* Although not etymologically related, the Common Semitic verbal roots *šty* and *šqy* (displaced in Arabic by *šariba*[1]) are everywhere associated semantically and functionally, with variations in particular geographical and linguistic areas. This article will not deal with the theoretical homonymous root *šth,* "weave."[2]

2. *Individual Languages.* a. *Akkadian.* The G stem of Akk. *šatû(m)* II refers to the act of drinking; there is a single unpublished example of the Š or causative stem with

---

comparées (1979), 122-31 = *FS L. A. Perot. BSal* 21 (1976), 89-98; A. Destro, *In caso di gelosia* (Bologna, 1989); idem, *The Law of Jealousy. Brown Judaic Studies* 181 (Atlanta, 1989); M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Baal *RPU* in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 VI 25-23," *UF* 12 (1980) 171-82; M. Fishbane, "Accusations of Adultery," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 25-45; T. Friedmann, "Origin and Transformation of a Biblical Image," *BethM* 113 (1988) 135-38 (Heb.); T. Frymer-Kensky, "The Strange Case of the Suspected Sotah (Numbers V 11-31)," *VT* 34 (1984) 11-26; G. Gerleman, "שׁתה *šth* to drink," *TLOT,* III, 1407-10; H. Gressmann, "ἡ κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων," *ZNW* 20 (1921) 224-30; S. Grill, "Der Schlachttag Jahwes," *BZ* 2 (1958) 278-83; J. Hahn, *Das Goldene Kalb. EH* XXIII/154 (1981), esp. 195-212; W. Helck, "Ess- und Trinksitten," *LexÄg,* II, 33-34; W. Herrmann, "Götterspeise und Göttertrank in Ugarit und Israel," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 205-16; A. W. Jenks, "Eating and Drinking in the OT," *ABD,* II, 250-54; A. Kammenhuber, "Nochmals: Der hethitische König trinkt Gott NN," in W. Gross et al., eds., *Text, Methode und Grammatik. FS W. Richter* (St. Ottielien, 1991), 221-26; S. E. Loewenstamm, "Eine lehrhafte ugaritische Trinkburleske," *UF* 1 (1969) 71-77; idem, "The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 481-90; idem, "The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf — A Rejoinder," *Bibl* 56 (1975) 330-43; O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel* (Darmstadt, 1990), esp. 219-20; W. McKane, "Poison, Trial by Ordeal and the Cup of Wrath," *VT* 30 (1980) 474-92; J. L. McLaughlin, "The *marzeaḥ* at Ugarit," *UF* 23 (1991) 265-81; J. Milgrom, "The Case of the Suspected Adulteress, Numbers 5:11-31," in R. E. Friedman, ed., *The Creation of Sacred Literature. UCP, Near Eastern Studies* 22 (1981), 69-75; idem, "On the Suspected Adulteress (Numbers V 11-31)," *VT* 35 (1985) 368-69; J. Morgenstern, "Trial by Ordeal Among the Semites," *HUCA Jubilee Volume 1875-1925* (1925), 113-43; F. Nötscher, "Sakrale Mahlzeiten vor Qumran," in H. Gross and F. Mussner, eds., *Lex tua veritas. FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 145-74; A. Palzkill, "πίνω *pinō* drink," *EDNT,* III, 88-90; M. Pesce, "Mangiare e bere il proprio giudizio," *RivB* 38 (1990) 495-513; M. H. Pope, "A Divine Banquet at Ugarit (RŠ 24.258)," in J. M. Efird, ed., *The Use of the OT in the New and Other Essays. FS W. F. Stinespring* (Durham, N.C., 1972), 170-203; R. Press, "Das Ordal im alten Israel," *ZAW* 51 (1933) 121-40, 227-55; G. Sandelin, *Wisdom as Nourisher. Acta Acad. Aboensis* A 64/3 (1986); J. M. Sasson, "Numbers 5 and the 'Waters of Judgement,'" *BZ* 16 (1972) 249-51; A. Schart, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. OBO* 98 (1990), esp. 184-210; R. Smend, "Essen und Trinken — Ein Stück Weltlichkeit des AT," *Die Mitte des AT. BEvT* 99 (1986), 200-211 = H. Donner et al., eds., *Beiträge der alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 446-59; W. von Soden, "Trunkenheit im babylonisch-assyrischen Schrifttum," *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 187-94 = *Al-Baḥīth. FS J. Henninger* (Bonn, 1976), 317-24; F. Stolz, "Rausch, Religion und Realität in Israel und seiner Umwelt," *VT* 26 (1976) 170-86; J. Tropper, "Ugaritisch *šqy:* 'trinken' oder 'tränken'?" *Or* 58 (1989) 233-42; S. Virgulin, "Il lauto convivio sul Sion (Jes 25,6-8)," *BeO* 11 (1969) 57-64; H. Wildberger, "Das Freudenmahl auf dem Zion," *TZ* 33 (1977) 373-83 = *Jahwe und sein Volk. GSAT. ThB* 66 (1979), 274-84.

1. *HAL,* II, 1667.
2. *HAL,* II, 1667: *šth* I; *BDB,* 1059: *šth* III; cf. W. Breder et al., *ZAH* 2 (1989) 227.

the meaning "cause to drink."[3] The G stem of *šaqû* III always has causative meaning, as does the rare iterative Gtn stem. The causative Š stem occupies a second semantic level: "cause to soak or drench." The N stem serves as the passive of the G stem on the first level: "be irrigated."[4] In the context of agriculture and animal husbandry, with its associated organizational structures and irrigation technology, derivatives of *šaqû(m)* III are about three times as numerous as derivatives of *šatû(m)* II:[5] irrigated land, workers, facilities, equipment, professions, hydraulic engineering,[6] not to mention mythology, magic, necromancy, and medicine. The office of "cupbearer" *(šāqû)*[7] reflects social hierarchy. In other Semitic languages (Old South Arabic, Ethiopic, Tigre), too, irrigation in the context of agriculture is a major theme of various word formations and semantic instantiations.[8]

b. *Ugaritic.* According to Tropper, Ugar. *šty* appears only in the G stem, whereas *šqy* is found in the G, D, and Š stems. The former — often without an explicit direct object — refers to a continuous action approaching a state. In contrast to all other Semitic languages, the G stem of *šqy* also means "drink," as a single specific action. The D and Š stems have different causative meanings: the D stem refers to a "single specific action," serving as the causative equivalent to the G stem of *šqy;* the Š stem refers to a "general action, often of long duration," serving as the causative of *šty* rather than *šqy.* The scenes are set exclusively in the milieu of the gods; the objects are wine, blood, and tears.[9]

3. *Common Features.* In Northwest Semitic *šty* appears only in the G stem, *šqy* only in the causative stem,[10] in mutual relationship.[11] Even outside the Semitic sphere — in other etymons — similar semantic and syntactic phenomena appear.[12] The broad literary domain is illustrated iconographically by genre scenes as well as by representations of the court and cult, the significance of which is not always clear.[13]

There are many analogies in ancient Near Eastern literature to the symbolic and metaphorical usage of the OT. In the case of Ugaritic, for example, Pardee[14] cites the following: someone drinks a cup of disgrace; a goddess eats the flesh and drinks the

---

3. *AHw,* III, 1202-3.

4. *AHw,* III, 1181; cf. *GaG,* §§96g,105t,145c.

5. *AHw,* III, 1181, 1203.

6. *AHw,* III, 1181.

7. *AHw,* III, 1182; also fem.: *AHw,* III, 1179.

8. *HAL,* II, 1639, 1667-68.

9. Tropper, 236, 241-42; see also idem, *Der ugaritische Kausativstamm und die Kausitivbildungen des Semitischen. Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas* 2 (Münster, 1990), 165-70.

10. *DISO,* 322; see also 318; Beyer, 718, 720.

11. See, e.g., U. Seidl, "Studien zum Vokabular der Landwirtschaft im Syrischen II," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 16 (1989) 89-139, esp. 91-93; *AP,* 99-102.

12. Kammenhuber.

13. E.g., *ANEP,* nos. 157-58, 675, 679-80; M. Metzger, *ZDPV* 99 (1983) 54-94; idem, *Königsthron und Gottesthron. AOAT* 15/1-2 (1985).

14. *UF* 7 (1975) 373.

occurrences approximately equal (5/7). In Aramaic we find only the G stem (peal) of *šth* (Dnl. 5:1-4,23).[25]

Of the 47 occurrences of *mišteh,*[26] 5 are in Genesis, 7 in DtrH, 5 in the Prophets, and 30 in the Writings (20 in Esther alone). There are so few occurrences of the other derivatives that their distribution tells us little. The numbers vary, depending on whether the *figura etymologica šāṯô* plus a finite form of *šth* is treated as a single unit, and whether the ptcps. *mašqeh* (Neh. 1:11; 2 Ch. 9:4) and *šiqqûy* are treated as verbs[27] or substantives.

2. *Verbs.* a. In the OT, in contrast to the rest of the ancient Near East,[28] only the created world drinks in the literal or figurative sense — human beings, occasionally animals and plants (2 S. 12:3; Ezk. 31:14,16; Nu. 20:8,11), the land (Dt. 11:11). Depending on the subject and even more on the object, other terms (esp. verbs) enter the semantic field of *šth/šqh.*

b. Water is named explicitly as the object of the verb only under special circumstances, as when it is dangerously scarce. Except in the phrase *mê-rō'š,* "poisoned water" (Jer. 8:14; 9:14[15]; 23:15),[29] its effect is always beneficent. It "revives" the thirsty (Jgs. 15:19a). Even the "scent of water" makes trees bud (Job 14:9; cf. Ps. 1:3; Jer. 11:19; 17:7-8; Ezk. 17:5ff.). The everyday activity of drinking or watering is often introduced by formulaic auxiliary expressions such as *bw'* (Gen. 30:38; 2 S. 11:11; 2 K. 9:34; Est. 7:1; Am. 4:1; etc.), *yšb lᵉ* (Jer. 16:8), and *ntn* (Ex. 17:2; Dt. 2:28; Jgs. 5:25 [cf. 4:19]; Dnl. 1:12; Prov. 31:3-7; in Ps. 69:22[21] practically synonymous with *šqh*). "Drinking" may be modified by such general expressions as *klh lᵉ* (Gen. 24:19,22), *l'h* niphal *lᵉ* (Ex. 7:18), *ykl lᵉ* (Ex. 7:21,24; 15:23), *ysp lᵉ* (Isa. 51:22), and *'bh lᵉ* (2 S. 23:16-17; 1 Ch. 11:18-19). Preliminary actions of obtaining a drink can be used in the sense of "drink": *qrb* hiphil (Jgs. 5:25), and *qwr* (2 K. 19:24//Isa. 37:25) or *ḥpr* (Ex. 7:24) used absolutely. The 19 occurrences of *š'b* all involve the drinking of water: in secular usage (Gen. 24:44; 2 S. 23:15-17; Ruth 2:9; 1 Ch. 11:18-19), in cultic settings (1 S. 7:6; 9:11), and in eschatological judgment (Nah. 3:14) or salvation (Isa. 12:3).

When used in connection with alcoholic beverages *(yayin, šēḵār, tîrôš, dam-'ênāḇ, ḥemer, mišraṯ 'ᵃnāḇîm), šth* and *šqh* share a motley lexical field. Some lexemes are always associated with alcohol. The most common is *škr;* it can mean "merry" (Gen. 43:34; 2 S. 11:13; Hag. 1:6; Cant. 5:1), "drunk" (Gen. 9:21; Jer. 25:27; cf. Isa. 24:9), or both at the same time (Isa. 29:9; 51:21; Jer. 25:27; Lam. 4:21). The vb. *sb'* is pejorative: "tope, booze" (Dt. 21:20; Isa. 56:12; Hos. 4:18; Prov. 23:20-21). The vb. *msk,* "mix," refers to alcohol, not necessarily in a critical sense (Isa. 5:22; Prov. 9:2,5; cf. Ps. 75:9[8]; 102:10[9]; Isa. 19:14). Negative connotations predominate: *l'ʿ* (Ob. 16), *hmh* (Zec. 9:15 MT), *g'š* and *hll* III hithpolel (Jer. 25:16), *mṣh* (Isa. 51:17; Ezk. 23:33-34;

25. P. W. Coxon, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 275-76.
26. On the form see W. Baumgartner, *TZ* 9 (1953) 156.
27. E.g., by Mandelkern: Prov. 3:8; Hos. 2:7(5); Ps. 102:10(9).
28. See Nötscher.
29. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* III, 57.

sion," an end in itself, or merely marked an occasion: weaning (Gen. 21:8), marriage (Gen. 29:22-25; Jgs. 14:10,12,17), a birthday (Gen. 40:20), a domestic celebration (Job 1:4-5), a memorial of the dead (the context suggested for *marzēaḥ:* Am. 6:6; Jer. 15:5[36]), a visit (Gen. 19:3; Jgs. 19:6), a way to nurture social ties (Gen. 26:30; 2 S. 3:20), cult and representation (e.g., 1 K. 3:15; cf. Jgs. 9:27; Est. 1 and 5, passim), vain self-aggrandizement (*k^emištēh hammelek̲,* 1 S. 25:36), or recollection of past deliverance (Est. 9:17-18,22).

Less precisely, *mišteh* is used for (noisy, boisterous) "festivities" (e.g., *bêṯ śimḥâ,* Eccl. 7:2,4; Est. 5:14; 7:8; 9:17-18,22; cf. 1 K. 4:20; 1 S. 30:16; Ps. 107:27). Figuratively it can refer to a happy life (e.g., Prov. 15:15, *mišteh ṯāmîḏ;* cf. also vv. 13,30). The book of Esther, with 20 of the 47 OT occurrences of *mišteh,* is organized around banquets and feasts;[37] the crucial turning point is marked by a unique series of related nouns: *śimḥâ w^eśāśôn layy^ehûḏîm mišteh w^eyôm ṭôḇ* (8:17a; 9:17-22).

The hapax legomenon *š^eṯîyâ* in Est. 1:8 has to do with drinking etiquette at court.[38] Another hapax legomenon, *š^eṯî* (Eccl. 10:17; cf. Sir. 31:28), occurs in a censure of dissolute leaders; its use as an antonym of *big^eḇûrâ*[39] shows that it is a pejorative term referring to the weakness of the uninhibited drunkard.

b. In 10 of its occurrences, the participial form *mašqeh* means "cupbearer." Of the other 8 or 9 occurrences, 7 mean "drink," never in a figurative sense. In at least one text, Gen. 13:10, it means "well-watered land." In Ezk. 45:15 it may have the same meaning; another possibility is "watering place."[40] The noun *šōqeṯ,* which occurs twice in pastoral settings (Gen. 24:20; 30:38), means "watering trough."[41]

4. *Thirst.* The most common word for thirst is → צמא *ṣm',* often used in conjunction with → רעב *r'b* (e.g., Dt. 28:48; 2 S. 17:29; Isa. 32:6; 65:13; Am. 8:11; Ps. 107:5,9; 2 Ch. 32:11). Thirst is often deadly (Ex. 17:3; Jgs. 15:18; Isa. 50:2; Am. 8:13; Hos. 2:5[3]). The Rabshakeh threatens to use it as a weapon against the besieged inhabitants of Jerusalem (Isa. 36:12//2 K. 18:27 *K;* cf. *Q*). Various words refer to the alleviation or quenching of thirst: *šth* (Ruth 2:9; Isa. 29:8; 65:13); *šqh* (Jgs. 4:19; Isa. 32:6; Ps. 69:22[21]; 104:11; Prov. 25:21); → שׁבר *šbr,* with connotations of external force (Isa. 55:1; Ps. 104:11); → שׂבע *śb',* "have or give enough (to drink)," more commonly associated with solid food (Am. 4:8; Ps. 107:9; Prov. 30:16).[42] Measures taken by God to alleviate thirst are described in greater detail (e.g., Jgs. 15:18; Isa. 41:17-18; 42:15; 43:20; Neh. 9:15,20).

---

36. E. F. Beach, "The Samaria Ivories, Marzeaḥ, and Biblical Texts," *BA* 56 (1993) 94-104, esp. 98-101.

37. A. Meinhold, *Esther. ZBK* 13 (1983), 11; idem, *VT* 33 (1983) 435-45.

38. C. A. Moore, Esther. *AB* (1971), 7-8.

39. H. Kosmala, → II, 369.

40. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, III. OBO* 50/3 (1992), 400-401; but cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 475.

41. *HAL,* II, 1650.

42. G. Warmuth, → XIV, 19-31; Y. Avishur, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures. AOAT* 210 (1984), 379, 401, 611.

(škr) with love" (Cant. 5:1). The woman would give her lover "spiced wine to drink" (Cant. 8:2).[43] Using this language (Prov. 5:19-20; cf. 20:1; Isa. 28:7), Prov. 5:15-16,18 decks conjugal love in metaphors of springs and water: "Drink water from your cistern and flowing water *(nōzᵉlîm)* from your well . . . your springs . . . streams . . . your fountain"[44] (cf. Prov. 9:17; Sir. 23:16; 26:12; *nōzᵉlîm* also has an erotic sense in Cant. 4:15).

Whether water or wine is drunk makes no difference. Probably the erotic associations of drinking are connected with pleasure, the euphoric effect of wine, the refreshing effect of water, and exclusive rights to sources of water (Prov. 5:15-18; 9:17; cf. Gen. 21:25-31; 26:15-25,32; Nu. 20:17-21). One illustration is the iconographic motif of a woman using a reed to drink from a jug while making love.[45]

b. Job's ideal picture of lifelong health (Job 21:23-24) concludes with the obscure words *ûmōaḥ ʿaṣmôṯāyw yᵉšuqqeh,* "and his bones are drenched with marrow" (v. 24b), as more recent scholars prefer to translate the clause.[46] The use of *šqh* probably voices a desire for "refreshment" (cf. Ps. 109:18; Job 20:11; 30:30). In Prov. 3:8 *rip'ûṯ* parallels *šiqqûy lᵉʿaṣmôṯeyḵā* (the only instance of *šqh* in Prov. 1–9; cf. *marpē' lāʿāṣem* in 16:24).

3. *Abstract Objects.* Prov. 26:6 frames a double comparison without a comparative particle or a conjunction. Sending an unreliable messenger (*kᵉsîl;* cf. 10:26; 13:17; 15:30; 22:21; 25:13,15) is like "amputating both legs, drinking violence/damage" *(ḥāmās šōṯeh).*[47] According to Eliphaz, mortals are fundamentally corrupt: they "drink iniquity like water" (*yišteh-laʿag kammāyim,* Job 34:7). All three terms are ethically negative.[48] Just as it is impossible to live without water, so it is impossible in practice to live without doing wrong (on this sense of *ḥāmās* see Gen. 6:13; Ps. 11:5; 58:3[2]; Prov. 8:36[49]). But this bothers the wicked no more than a drink of water.[50] They do not resist. Possibly Prov. 13:2aα presupposes such connaturality when it subsumes both *ṭôḇ* and *ḥāmās* under the single vb. *'kl.*[51]

4. *Lady Wisdom.* Lady Wisdom issues an invitation to enter her house: "Eat my bread and drink the wine I have mixed" (9:5), promising the simple (*peṯî,* vv. 4,16) freedom, life, and "progress in the way of insight" (vv. 5-6). In Sir. 15:3 she gives those who fear God and hold to the law "the bread of insight to eat and the water of wisdom

43. Translation based on O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. tr. 1994), 167, 256.

44. Translation based on A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), I, 100.

45. Keel, *Song,* 45, 85, 182-84, esp. ills. 111 and 112; U. Winter, *Frau und Göttin. OBO* 53 (1983), 349-54, 618 n. 774, ills. 346-48; J. S. Cooper, *RLA,* IV, 259-69.

46. E.g., G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 336, 345, citing Prov. 3:8; A. de Wilde, *Das Buch Hiob. OTS* 22 (1981) 225, 228-29; EÜ; NRSV; cf. comms. For a different interpretation see E. A. Knauf, *BN* 7 (1978) 22-24.

47. H. Haag, → IV, 479-80.

48. On *laʿag* see C. Barth, → VIII, 10-14.

49. J. Reider, *VT* 4 (1954) 284-85.

50. J. Lévêque, *Job et son Dieu. ÉtB,* 2 vols. (1970), I, 264-66, 270-71; C. Barth, → VIII, 13.

51. W. Bühlmann, *Vom Rechten Reden und Schweigen. OBO* 12 (1976), 312-13.

Blum speaks of "diachronic complexity."[57] The recent radical changes in pentateuchal studies[58] have made the "traditional" assignments of these texts to literary sources[59] more problematic than ever. There is good reason, therefore, to pass over the associated variations in emphasis (which in any case could not be discussed in detail here), especially since they hardly affect the raw material, the motifs of thirst and drinking, but only how these are used in each particular setting.

c. During their subsequent desert wandering, the Israelites seek access to the wells belonging to the occupants of the land (Nu. 20:17-21; 21:21-24; Dt. 2:5-6,28-30; cf. Isa. 55:1; Lam. 5:4). With the grandiose claim to have drunk water (in conquered lands), the Rabshakeh asserts one of the rights of a conqueror (Isa. 37:25// 2 K. 19:24).

When Jeremiah asks, "What do you gain by going to Egypt, to drink the waters of the Nile, and what do you gain by going to Assyria, to drink the waters of the Euphrates?" (Jer. 2:18), he is alluding rhetorically to the exodus to castigate the furtive search for help from abroad (cf. Dt. 17:16; 28:68; Isa. 31:1-3; Ezk. 17:7; also Ex. 13:17; Nu. 14:3-4). For Israel "drinking the waters of the Nile or Euphrates" can only mean dependency — forced, but nevertheless accepted (cf. Jer. 2:16,36-37; Lam. 5:4,6)[60] — and return to their former servitude.

d. Later, especially in the Psalms, these acts of deliverance become motives for praising God: pollution of the drinking water in Egypt (Ps. 78:44; 105:29), water from the rock (Ps. 78:15-20; 81:8[7]; 95:8-9; 105:41; 106:32; cf. honey from the rock, 81:17[16]). Except for Ps. 78:15b (*šqh;* cf. Nu. 20:8bβ), however, these texts use a poetic paraphrase rather than *šth/šqh.*

2. *Ex. 24:11.* The frequent terse formula "eat in the presence of Yahweh" (Ex. 18:12; Dt. 12:7; 14:23,26; 15:20; Ezk. 44:3) is expanded in Ex. 24:11 (cf. vv. 1-2,9-11) by the addition of *wayyištû.* The only other occurrence of this expansion is in the Chronicler's special material describing the "second" enthronement of Solomon (1 Ch. 29:22a), probably with the purpose of being as complete as possible (cf. vv. 21-15). The statement "they ate and drank" in Ex. 24:11 concludes the theophany of v. 10, which is noteworthy in several respects. Not only are those who "saw the God of Israel" (vv. 10a,11bα) protected from otherwise certain death (v. 11; cf. Gen. 32:31[30]; Ex. 20:19; 33:20; Jgs. 6:22-23; 13:22-23; Isa. 6:5). They are also included among "the nobility of the people of Israel" (Ex. 24:11a), i.e., the official representa-

57. Ibid., 242; cf. H. Seebass, "Que reste-t-il du Yahwiste et de l'Élohiste?" in A. de Pury, ed., *Le Pentateuque en question* (Geneva, 1989), 199-232.

58. See J. Vermeylen, "Les premiers étapes littéraires de la formation du Pentateuque," in de Pury, ed., *Pentateuque en question,* 149-97; E. Zenger, "Le thème de la 'Sortie d'Égypte' et la naissance du Pentateuque," in ibid., 301-21.

59. In addition to the comms. see esp. H. Cazelles, *DBS,* VII, 687-858, esp. 784, 786, 805, 841; also H. Seebass, *TRE,* IX, 520-24; XVI, 441-51; L. Schmidt, *TRE,* XXI, 211-22.

60. S. Herrmann, *Jeremia. BK* XII, 2 vols. (1986-90), II, 96, 132-36.

tives (cf. Ex. 18:12; Isa. 24:21-23; 40:5). This event is probably anticipated by Ex. 3:12.[61]

At this "high point of Israel's unspoiled relationship with God,"[62] an event of great solemnity, *šth* does not add a supplementary element but rather brings to perfect concentration a widespread poetic motif, especially common in the Psalms (e.g., Ps. 23:5-6; 27:4; 63:2-9[1-8]). At the opposite pole, when this relationship is broken, the people "sit down to eat and drink" between offering sacrifice and rising up to play, without any reference to Yahweh or hierarchical representation (Ex. 32:6).[63]

3. *Individual Figures.* a. In the two well episodes of J, *šth/šqh* marks a crucial turning point. Abraham's servant takes a polite and accommodating offer of drinking water as a sign that God has granted him success in his mission (Gen. 24:12-14,18-19,43-46). Moses' chivalrous conduct at the well establishes a momentous relationship with the family of the high priest of Midian (Ex. 2:16-17,19).

Several episodes reflect a wilderness schema similar to the exodus traditions: dangerous lack of water — urgent appeal to God — God's providential gift of water.

When Hagar, wandering in the wilderness (Gen. 21:9-21 [E]; cf. 16:4-12 [J]), had already abandoned her child (21:15-16), "God heard the voice of the boy. . . . Then God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water. She went, and filled the skin with water, and gave the boy a drink" (vv. 17aα,19). Thus God safeguards his ongoing plans for the boy (v. 20; cf. vv. 18b,20b-21; 16:10-12; Ex. 17:7bβ).

Samson "was very thirsty, and he called on Yahweh, saying, 'You have granted this great victory by the hand of your servant, but now I am dying of thirst. . . .' Then God split open the *maḵtēš* . . . so that water poured out. When he drank, his *rûaḥ* returned, and he revived" (Jgs. 15:18-19). Paronomasia (*leḥî — balleḥî — wayyeḥî,* vv. 17,19) links this episode seamlessly with that of the donkey's jawbone (vv. 15-17). Drinking is therefore not a situational element; it presents itself as a free-floating motif representing a vivifying act of God to achieve his purposes with Samson (v. 20; cf. v. 18; 13:5,25; 16:28,31).[64]

Elijah is to "drink from the wadi." Since the episode presupposes a drought, this source of water is unexpected and precarious, as is the food provided by ravens in the wilderness and by the widow in a foreign land (1 K. 17:4,6-7,10). While the narrative setting — Wadi Cherit and Zarephath — at least takes schematic account of the climatic and human environment, Elijah's deliverance after planning to die in the wilderness is stylized

---

61. T. C. Vriezen, *OTS* 17 (1972) 111-15; B. Renaud, *La théophanie du Sinaï, Ex 19–24. CahRB* 30 (1991) 177-78; E. W. Nicholson, *VT* 24 (1974) 77-97; idem, *VT* 25 (1975) 69-79; idem, *VT* 26 (1976) 148-60.

62. Blum, *Studien,* 72.

63. Ibid., 51-52, 89-91; idem, "Israël à la montagne de Dieu," in de Pury, ed., *Pentateuque en question,* 275.

64. J. C. Exum, *VT* 33 (1983) 30-45; idem and J. W. Whedbee, "Isaac, Samson, and Saul," in Y. T. Raddai and A. Brenner, eds., *On Humour and the Comic in the Hebrew Bible. JSOTSup* 92 (1990), 134-55; R. G. Boling, *Judges. AB* (1975), 239-41.

counts are unclear.[75] There are, however, comparable "destruction rituals" in the ancient Near East.[76]

Just as the initial acts of burning and pulverizing are not to be understood in an historical and technological sense, but as literary symbols of total and final destruction, so the scattering of the remnants and making the people drink the mixture are to be read as a literary and ritual cipher. "Making the people drink" refers less to the ingestion of water than to a final compulsory act that destroys the corpus delicti and punishes the malefactors (cf. Nu. 5:11-31).

Another sign of ulterior theological motives is probably the placing of the personal object of *šqh* at the very conclusion of the narrative, after several mentions of *ʿam* and two of "Israel" (Ex. 32:4,8): "He forced the drink upon the Israelites" (v. 20b). The speaker behind Dt. 9:21 can omit the drinking because he has other concerns, without on that account being "incomplete."[77] The literary setting of the ritual hardly argues for its actual historical performance. Not even in Gen. 44:5,15 is it clear whether and how the use of a cup for divination (*nḥš* piel) involved drinking. Here, as in Nu. 5:11-31, attempts to rationalize the account technologically or physiologically overlook the intentions and opportunities of the texts.[78]

VI. Creation and History. Occasionally we find *šth/šqh* used for God's actions in the realms we distinguish as "(initial) creation," "cosmos," "nature," and "history." Against the background of ancient Near Eastern language and imagery, these realms may intersect.[79]

1. *J's Creation Account.* In the two occurrences of *šqh* in J's creation account (Gen. 2:6,10), the active subjects are impersonal: *ʾēḏ* and *nāhār.* They flow without interruption *(yaʿaleh, yôṣēʾ),*[80] guaranteeing constant "irrigation" or "watering" *(wehišqâ, lehašqôṯ).* This watering is needed for the "forming" of human beings (v. 7), for their habitat and primal biography (v. 10; cf. vv. 8-9,15), in a world without boundaries or in a deliberate expansion beyond the limits of the inherently delimited "garden" (vv. 11-14). The objects of the verbs are not persons but their habitat: "the whole face of the ground" and "the garden."

These observations based on vv. 6 and 10 remain valid for the present form of the text regardless of source-critical hypotheses. However the present coupling of these verses is interpreted, the "watering" is a primal given; its origins are beyond inquiry. God is at work in it and through it, for the sake of humanity and the world to be shaped as humanity's home. The negative details in v. 5 have even been seen as a corrective to a feared theological deficiency in this tradition (v. 6).[81]

---

75. See Begg.

76. U. Rüterswörden, *BN* 2 (1977) 16-22; F. C. Fensham, *IEJ* 16 (1966) 191-93; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987), 66-153; Begg, 210-33.

77. Begg, 233-51.

78. McKane, 478-87; S. Wefing, *ZAW* 93 (1981) 352ff.

79. U. Rüterswörden, *SJOT* 2 (1989) 1-22; J. Cornelius, *JNSL* 14 (1988) 41-83.

80. *GK* §§107b,d, 112a.

81. C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. SBB* 17 (1988), 47-55; also W. W. Müller, *TUAT,* II, 451-52.

4. *The Sanctuary.* a. Ps. 36:6-8(5-7) represents the natural cosmos within the sanctuary.[90] V. 9(8) appears to exploit the ambiguity of the root *'dn:* "They ['all people'] feast *(rwh)* on the fat of your house, and from the river of your *'ᵃḏānîm*/Eden river you given them drink." The delights of the sanctuary are "Eden." The concluding *tašqēm,* unlike the chiastically parallel *yirwᵉyûn,*[91] addresses God the giver directly in the 2d person, eclipsing all that has gone before (cf. Isa. 58:11; Jer. 31:12).[92]

b. In describing luxuriant fertility, two visions of the river flowing from the Jerusalem temple (Ezk. 47:1-12; Zec. 14:8-11) make do without *šth/šqh.* Not so the oracle that concludes the book of Joel (4:18-21[3:18-21]): "And in that day . . . a spring shall come forth from the house of Yahweh and water the Valley of Acacias/Wadi Shittim" (v. 18).[93] Again the diction recalls Gen. 2:10 *(yṣ', šqh).* The "Valley of Acacias" is no more an identifiable geographical entity than are the other symbolic valleys (vv. 2,12,14); it is paradigmatic of the dramatic transformation and utopian abundance of "that day" (vv. 18a,19-21; cf. Isa. 66:12) and the expansion of the realm of blessing.[94] Here *šqh* denotes blessing in the sense of universal salvation.

5. *The Law.* Possibly inspired by such images, Jesus Sirach freely uses the notion of paradise for his remarkable experience while studying the law. He wanted "to water the garden . . . like a canal from the river"; his canal became a river, his river a sea (Sir. 24:30-31).[95]

6. *History.* a. In Ezekiel's allegory (*māšāl/ḥîḏâ,* Ezk. 17:2) of the "house of Israel" (17:3-10), the vine (Jehoiachin) is provided with "abundant water" (v. 5; cf. also v. 8; 19:10; 31:4-5,7). Nevertheless "this vine stretched out its roots toward him [the 'other eagle,' i.e., Egypt] and shot out its branches toward him to be given drink *(lᵉhašqôṯ 'ōṯâ),* away from the bed where it had been planted" (v. 7).[96] The implicit impersonal object of the infinitive of purpose *lᵉhašqôṯ* is water; the vine itself is both personal object (*nota accusativi* with suf.: *'ōṯâ*) and subject. This striking reflexive *lᵉhašqôṯ* probably means to say that the vine wanted a better supply of water, wanted to drink more, strove mightily for a qualitative improvement in its own situation. Here the transitive sense of *šqh* hiphil is attenuated; it was probably chosen deliberately, counter to its inherent semantic tendency, in combination with irrelevant imagery, to caricature the political stance that the author found so incomprehensible.

---

90. B. Kedar-Kopfstein, → X, 484.

91. P. Maiberger, → XIII, 357-61.

92. Tournay, *RB* 90 (1983) 15-19; P. E. Dion, "La bilingue de Tell Fekherye," in A. Caquot et al., eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS M. Delcor. AOAT* 215 (1985), 139-47, esp. 143.

93. Cf. W. S. Prinsloo, "The Unity of the Book of Joel," *ZAW* 104 (1992) 66-81.

94. F. E. Deist, "Parallels and Reinterpretation in the Book of Joel," in W. Claassen, ed., *Text and Context. FS F. C. Fensham. JSOTSup* 48 (1988), 63-79.

95. Gilbert, *RTL* 5 (1974) 339-41.

96. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 355-56, 362; M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20. AB* (1983), 311-12, 317-18.

3d person discourse betrays the use of stock formulas. When Yahweh restores the fortunes of Israel, the people will plant vineyards and drink their own wine (Am. 9:14). Some variations on this theme do not use *šth/šqh* (Lev. 26:16; Dt. 28:30-33; Isa. 65:21-22; Jer. 29:5; 31:5,14; Lam. 2:12).

The ironsmith who fashions images is mocked (Isa. 44:9-20) because he can neither satisfy his hunger nor slake his thirst: "He becomes hungry and his strength fails, he drinks no water and is faint" (v. 12b).[100] Following popular opinion, Hosea's faithless wife (Hos. 2:7,10-11[5,8-9]) believes that it was her lovers who gave her — among other things — her water and her drink *(šiqqûyāy).* Since Yahweh's own list of concrete gifts does include this, it may possibly be understood as a positive affirmative summary in the sense of "choice beverages."[101]

b. The nature and formulation of the punishment of Hosea's unfaithful wife — "I will put an end to *(wᵉhišbattî)* all her mirth, her festivals, her new moon and sabbath, and all her celebrations" (Hos. 2:13[11])[102] — may have occasioned Jeremiah's prophecy[103] that God will bring all (nuptial) festivities to an end (*šbt* hiphil, Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10), whatever these may have to do with the actual cult (e.g., Jgs. 9:27; 1 K. 3:15; cf. 2 K. 6:22-23; Neh. 8:9-12; 2 Ch. 1:13). Objectively, it means an end of merry drinking with singing; and the wine itself tastes sour (Isa. 24:9; Lam. 5:15). However, the end of drinking is not God's actual judgment but a consequence or an epiphenomenon (Jer. 7:34b; 25:9-11).

In the time of great mortality (Jer. 16:1-9),[104] when the normal mourning customs are ignored and the dead even remain unburied (vv. 4-6), "no one will break bread[105] for *('al)* mourning [or: for the mourner[106]] to offer comfort for the dead; nor shall anyone give them [or: him[107]] a cup of consolation to drink on account of his father or mother" *(wᵉlō' yašqû 'ōṯām kôs tanḥûmîm 'al-'āḇîw wᵉ'al-'immô,* v. 7b). The hapax legomenon "cup of consolation" paints a clearer picture than *leḥem,* which is textually uncertain. Counterparts include "mourners' bread" and similar expressions (Hos. 9:4; Dt. 26:14; 2 S. 3:35; 12:17,20-23; Ezk. 24:17) as well as the "consoling breast" that awaits those who mourn over Jerusalem when salvation dawns (Isa. 66:11).

As a personal symbolic act (cf. Jer. 16:2), Yahweh commands Jeremiah "not to go into a *bêṯ-mišteh* to sit with them, to eat and drink" (v. 8) — probably referring to a house where people are presently celebrating (cf. also Eccl. 7:2,4)[108] — or a *bêṯ marzēaḥ* (Jer. 16:5a).[109] When salvation dawns, communal festivities will return

100. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 426-27.

101. F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB* (1980), 232-33.

102. Translation following W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 62.

103. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremie 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 129-30.

104. McKane, *Jeremiah,* I, 362-68.

105. See *BHS.*

106. See *BHS.*

107. See *BHS.*

108. D. Michel, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet. BZAW* 183 (1989), 126-37.

109. H.-J. Fabry, → IX, 10-15; S. Ackerman, *Under Every Green Tree. HSM* 46 (1992), 71-79; McLaughlin.

(33:10-11) — in Trito-Isaiah, with images of intensive, carefree drinking on the part of sucklings and adults (*ynq, śbʿ, mṣṣ:* Isa. 66:10-11; 60:16; cf. Tob. 13:15-16).

2. *Causes.* Amos denounces the luxury in which "those who are at ease in Zion and those who feel secure on Mount Samaria" live (Am. 6:1-7). In the second strophe (vv. 4-7) he uses four successive active participles, each continued by a finite verb, to pound home his attack: "those who lie . . . those who eat . . . those who howl . . . those who drink from wine bowls and anoint themselves with the finest oils, but are not grieved over the ruin of Joseph." The final participial phrase is simply one of four in the same strophe, but its climactic position, construction, and vocabulary make it emphatic: "those who drink from wine bowls" (*haššōṯîm bᵉmizrᵉqê yayin,* v. 6aα). The only other OT passage to use the prep. *bᵉ* with a vessel drunk from *(šth)* is Gen. 44:5, but the usage is attested at Ugarit.[110] The noun *mizrāq* raises more questions. The other 31 occurrences refer to a vessel used in the cult.[111] Amos may be suggesting cultic associations as an aggravating circumstance; the music mentioned in v. 5 could also point in this direction.[112] Such an association is subject to sapiential censure in other passages: the Israelites "drink *yên ʿᵃnûšîm* in the house of their God [gods?]" (Am. 2:8b; cf. vv. 7a,8a; also 8:4-7; Zeph. 1:9; Ex. 22:25-26; Dt. 24:1-13,17).

Joel 4:3(3:3) accuses nations hostile to Israel of similar transgressions: not only have they treated "my people" like merchandise, they have traded young men and women in order to satisfy their lust and to obtain wine to drink. "Wine of violence" is a concise symbol for the law of the jungle, which does not respect even the sanctuary, although the sages have already inveighed against it: "They eat bread from wickedness and drink wine from violence" (*kî laḥᵃmû leḥem rešaʿ wᵉyên ḥᵃmāsîm yištû,* Prov. 4:7).[113] Israel has even forced the nazirites to drink wine (Am. 2:12; cf. Nu. 6:1-21; Jgs. 13:5,7; Jer. 35).

Isa. 5:22-24 indicts the "heroes at drinking" who affect to be *gibbôrîm* and *ʾanšê-ḥayil,* putting a brave face on their vicious behavior (cf. Sir. 31:25a), and describes them ironically[114] as weak, unjust, and unscrupulous (vv. 23-24; cf. v. 20). Isa. 5:11 uses a parallel construction to present subtly a shameful role reversal: "Woe to those who rise early in the morning in pursuit of strong drink *(šēḵār yirdōpû);* when they tarry in the evening, it is wine that inflames them *(yayin yaḏlîqêm).*"[115] The following verse summarily criticizes their "feastings" (*mištêhem;* cf. Am. 4:4-6): it is a "feast for them" — probably because they love it (cf. Mic. 2:11; Zec. 7:6). This language might allude to the "counterfestival" of Isa. 22:13: the people respond to God's call for repentance (v. 12) by calling for "joy and festivity, killing oxen and slaughtering sheep, eating meat and drinking wine, eating and drinking" — "let us eat and drink, for tomor-

110. Dahood, *Bibl* 54:365-66; D. G. Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 373.
111. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 186ff.; *HAL,* I, 567.
112. Andersen and Freedman, *Amos,* 567-69.
113. Translation following Meinhold, *Sprüche,* I, 94.
114. *GesB*[18], 193.
115. See J. J. M. Roberts, *CBQ* 54 (1992) 41-43.

row we die."[116] But they receive the opposite.[117] Isa. 5:13 threatens *(lāḵēn)* exile, "hunger," and "thirst" instead of *kāḇôḏ* and *hāmôn* (cf. Isa. 3:24; 65:13). After the enemy invasion, the wine that all have been craving is no more (Joel 1:5aβ; cf. 1:2–2:17).

The guests at Belshazzar's *leḥem raḇ* (Dnl. 5:1) are taken to task for drinking wine and praising the gods (vv. 4,23; cf. Isa. 65:11bα). The point is the sacrilegious misuse of the vessels from the temple as drinking vessels,[118] which brings on the end (5:30–6:1).[119]

Naturally the prophets are aware of the consequences of immoderate drinking, but they focus on sanctions imposed by Yahweh on the community. In such contexts "drinking" hardly ever appears in isolation, but somehow it casts its shadow — at least visually — on other verbs and modes of behavior. It is the unmistakable stigma of a "secular" way of life, far removed from God, which "brings on" divine judgment (Am. 6:3).

3. *God as Author.* a. Laments recount individual or collective suffering of which God is the author, without interpreting it automatically as God's judgment. The community laments: "You have fed them/us with the bread of tears and given them/us tears to drink in full measure" (Ps. 80:6[5]; LXX reads the 1st person pl. suf.). An individual laments: "I eat ashes like bread, and mingle tears with my drink *(wešiqquway biḇeḵî māsaḵtî)*" (102:10[9]). V. 9(8) blames this affliction on the machinations of enemies, but v. 11(10) ascribes it to God's anger.

In Ps. 60:5a(3a) the metaphor follows a direct statement: "You have made us see/suffer hard things; you have given us wine to drink that makes us reel *(hišqîṯānû yayin tarʿēlâ)*." The unusual *tarʿēlâ* following *yayin* (absolute) is probably an attributive apposition specifying result:[120] loss of self-control *(rʿl;* cf. Isa. 51:17,22) and helplessness (cf. Jer. 15:17; 23:9). The negative term "tears" in association with the meal, where God is the only subject (Ps. 60:5[3]; 80:6[5]) or at least the critical subject (102:11[10]), lends an element of grotesquerie to the meal: tears to drink together with "dust" and "ashes" (Job 2:8; 42:6; Lam. 3:16; cf. 2 S. 12:16) constitute poetically the "meal" imposed by God. Similar expressions — in other situations — appear already at Ugarit.[121]

b. In his second discourse Job laments: "Truly, the arrows of *šadday* are in me; my spirit/life drinks their poison" (Job 6:4). In the second line, *ʾašer ḥamāṯām šōṯâ rûḥî,* the ptcp. *šōṯâ* is semantically parallel to *ʿimmāḏî* in the first (cf. 28:14: *ʿimmāḏî//bî;* 7:11: "I"*//rûḥî//napšî*). Syntactically, *ḥamāṯām* could be the subject of *šōṯâ* and *rûḥî* the object: "their [the arrows'] wrath/poison exhausts my spirit /life" (cf. LXX). More likely, however, *rûḥî* is the subject and *ḥamāṯām* the object, as in the proposed translation.

116. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 349, 353, 370-76.
117. E. Jacob, *Esaïe 1–12. CAT* VIIIa (1987), 88.
118. O. Plöger, *Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 82, 84-85.
119. Ibid., 82.
120. *GK,* §131c.
121. *TO,* I, 254.

This interpretation is supported by 21:20: "Let the eyes [of the wicked] see his destruction, and let him drink of the wrath of the Almighty *(ûmēḥ^{a}maṯ šadday yišteh)*."[122] Wrath (or poison) penetrates to the core, inexorably and irreversibly.[123] Whether *ḥēmâ* means "heat," "poison," "excitation," or "wrath,"[124] the "drinking" contaminates and destroys not just an aspect but the very existence of the person (cf. Job 17:1).

4. *Yahweh's Judgment Feast.* Although feast and cup are related semantically, the imagery using *šth* and *šqh* always focuses on one motif or the other, never on both together.

In the expansion of the oracle concerning the destruction of Gog (Ezk. 39:2b,4a),[125] speaking in the name of Yahweh, Ezekiel solemnly invites the birds and wild animals "to my *zeḇaḥ* . . . upon the mountains of Israel, and you shall eat flesh and drink blood. You shall eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes of the earth. . . . You shall eat fat until you are filled, and drink blood until you are drunk, at the sacrificial feast that I am preparing for you" (vv. 17-19). Perhaps animals are invited so as to avoid having humans drink and become drunk on human blood. Blood and fat are strictly reserved for Yahweh (44:7,15; Lev. 3:17; 7:23-27; cf. Gen. 9:4-6); elsewhere only lions drink blood (Nu. 23:24) and only Yahweh makes his arrows drunk with blood (Dt. 32:42; cf. Isa. 34:6). (In the Deir ʿAlla texts it is possible that swine drink wine as an element of chaos.[126]) In Ezk. 39:20, which concludes the section, realistic elements are more in evidence than in v. 19: "You shall be filled at my table with horses and chariot horses, with heroes and all warriors."[127] Zec. 9:15, a difficult text, may be a free imitation or reminiscence in a theophanic setting (v. 14): "They shall devour . . . and drink, be inflamed as by wine . . . and be full like a bowl, like the horns of the altar."[128]

In Jer. 51:36-40 God gives a feast to defend the cause of Zion/Jerusalem and to punish Babylon: "When they [the lions, v. 38] are inflamed, I will set out a feast for [or: against] them and make them drunk, until they become merry" (v. 39;[129] for *ʿlz* in this sense of "be merry" cf. 2 S. 1:20; Jer. 15:17; 50:11; Ps. 94:3). For *mišteh* the Greek versions have *pótēma* (LXX) or *pótos* (Aq.). God uses alcohol to turn aggressive bravado *(b^{e}ḥummām)* into illusory euphoria[130] and finally defenseless loss of consciousness (cf. Isa. 22:13; Jer. 12:8; 49:19; 50:44; Hos. 7:5). The unique syntagm of *mišteh* as the object of *šyt* with God as subject instead of the usual *ʿśh mišteh* with a human subject is probably intended to avoid the spontaneous notion of an invitation freely accepted. For

122. On the translation see Fohrer, *Hiob*, 337-38, 344-45.
123. F. Horst, *Hiob I: 1–19. BK* XVI/1 (1968), 94, 101.
124. Lévêque, *Job et son Dieu*, I, 346-52; K.-D. Schunck, → IV, 462-63, 464-65.
125. B. Lang, *Ezechiel. EdF* 153 (1981), 110-12.
126. V. Sasson, *UF* 17 (1985) 288, 301.
127. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 294.
128. MT; see A. Lacocque, *Zacharie 9–14. CAT* XIc (1981), 157-60.
129. See *BHS;* Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, II*, 849-50.
130. K.-M. Beyse, → IV, 474.

the Babylonians (only here and in Isa. 5:12 does the suffix in *mištêhem* have the force of a dative[131]), the feast means sure and ineluctable destruction (cf. Isa. 34:6).

In the war between the deities at Ugarit, we already find a feast coupled with a massacre.[132] The concatenation of disparate images without regard for their compatibility is a stylistic feature; the elements should not be separated on historical or technical grounds (cf. Jer. 51:38-40,57: feast, lions, perpetual sleep, slaughter; Zec. 9:15: "slingstones"). God sees to it that Israel's enemies are forced to "drink" — whether they drink blood or wine, they are no longer a threat to God's people (cf. Zec. 9:15: *gnn*).

5. *Yahweh's Feast as Salvation for the Nations.* In Isa. 25:6-8, an apocalyptic oracle of salvation, *mišteh* represents the coming universal salvation: "On this mountain Yahweh of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines" (v. 6; cf. 1 S. 25:36; 1 K. 8:62-66; Neh. 8:10). Without formal invitation (in contrast to Isa. 55:1-3), "all peoples" share in this unique feast. Universal salvation is concentrated "on this mountain," i.e., "on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem" (Isa. 24:23 [cf. vv. 21-23]; cf. also Isa. 2:2-4; 45:14; 60:3-18; 62:2; Mic. 4:1-3; Zeph. 3:9-10; Ps. 96:7-10; 72:10-11). Isa. 24:23b is a later related text that gives voice to the subliminally active perspective of Ex. 24:10-11: "Yahweh is king . . . *wᵉneged zᵉqēnāyw kāḇôḏ*."[133]

Isa. 55:1 (cf. 12:3) is an urgent invitation to share freely in God's abundance; the absence of *šth/šqh* among the many imperatives may be accidental or a deliberate stylistic device.[134] But since the two "normal" verbs do not occur in either of the salvation texts, it is worthwhile asking cautiously whether there may be some reason. Does usage associate them more with judgment than with salvation? The notion of sweat and strain is foreign to salvation, the gift of God, whereas the pangs of judgment require all to overcome their rising aversion and "drink" (cf. Ezk. 39:17-19). The cup motif also seems to point in this direction.

6. *Yahweh's Cup.*[135] In the context of judgment rather than salvation (Ps. 16:5; 116:13a),[136] *šth/šqh* appear with Yahweh's cup as the direct object, without any explicit reference to a feast.[137]

a. The fourth woe oracle of Habakkuk (Hab. 2:15-17) begins with an attack on the

131. See, e.g., JM, §129h; H. S. Nyberg, *Hebreisk Grammatik* (Uppsala, 1952), §84f.

132. B. Lang, → IV, 29; *TO,* I, 159-61.

133. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 453, 530-35; idem, *TZ* 33:374.

134. W. Brueggemann, in R. Albertz et al., eds., *Schöpfung und Befreiung. FS C. Westermann* (Stuttgart, 1989), 126-28; H. C. Spykerboer, "Isaiah 55:1-5," in J. Vermeylen, ed., *Book of Isaiah. BETL* 81 (1989), 357-59.

135. For a general discussion see Bourget; → כוס *kôs.*

136. M. L. Barré, *JBL* 109 (1990) 61-78; H. Gese, *Essays on Biblical Theology* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1981), 130.

137. On the more or less likely cultural and cultic background see Brongers; G. Fohrer, *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Propheten, 1949-1965. BZAW* 99 (1967), 257-61.

conduct of a host: "Woe to him who makes his neighbor drink . . . until he is drunk in order to gaze on his nakedness" (v. 15 MT; on exposure as a consequence of drunkenness cf. Gen. 9:21-23; 19:32-35; Lam. 4:21). The const. ptcp. *mašqēh rēʿēhû* almost certainly does not take aim at a single act but rather a habit, almost a continuing state (cf. Am. 4:1; 6:1-6). The consequence is framed as a *talion,* with an appended theological interpretation: "You also must drink and expose your foreskin [MT; *BHS* and NRSV: 'stagger,' following the Dead Sea Scrolls and LXX]; the cup in Yahweh's right hand will come around to you" (v. 16).[138] The same ideas and expressions appear at Ugarit.[139] The contrast between intended prestige *(kāḇôḏ)* and actual disgrace *(qālôn, qîqālôn)*[140] was probably so shopworn that it was easy for semantically relevant terms derived from similar roots (*ʿwr, ʿrl, rʿl:* vv. 15-16) to become entangled and contribute to the confusion.[141]

The cup metaphor is developed most extensively — originally probably in the context of the oracles against the nations (Jer. 46–51 MT; Jer. 26–31 LXX) — in Jer. 25:15-29 (MT; LXX 32:13-29),[142] in the form of a 1st person narrative introduced by several heterogeneous elements: "Truly Yahweh, the God of Israel, said to me: Take from my hand this cup of wine, of wrath, and make all the nations to whom I send you drink it" (v. 15). The construct phrase *kôs hayyayin* is probably an ad hoc hapax legomenon; the words *haḥēmâ hazzōʾṯ,* with the definite article, are added asyndetically. However they crept into the text and whatever their syntax (Barthélemy favors apposition[143]), they associate the cup with God's wrath. With *wᵉšāṯû* (not in LXX), v. 16a continues Yahweh's instructions by anticipating two consequences: the hithpoel of *gʿš* and *hll* III.[144] Without any transition, the same clause attributes these consequences to the "sword" (*mippᵉnê haḥereḇ,* v. 16b), which plays no role in v. 17, where the prophet carries out Yahweh's instructions.

In v. 27 (which takes up the themes of vv. 15-17, including the sword), Jeremiah is commanded to reinforce verbally and interpret the instructions of v. 15 (cf. v. 17): "Say to them: Thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Drink, get drunk, and vomit, fall and do not rise, because of the sword." Of the four following verbs introduced by the conjunction *wᵉ,* the first two *(wᵉšiḵrû ûqᵉyû)* remain within the sphere of intoxication (cf. Isa. 19:14; 28:8; Nah. 3:11); the latter two ("fall" and "not rise") have more to do with the "sword." The second verb in the description of how Jeremiah carries out his instructions (*wāʾašqeh,* "and I made drink," v. 17) is followed by a lengthy list of nations (vv. 18-26) — beginning with Jerusalem and Judah in the MT (v. 18). V. 28 deals

138. J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), 60, 65, 72-73; E. Otto, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 73-107; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *ZAW* 98 (1986) 400-415; R. D. Haak, *Habakkuk. SVT* 44 (1992), 67-70, 135.

139. *KTU* 1.4, III, 16; *TO,* I, 201.

140. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* III, 143-44.

141. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, III,* 849-55.

142. G. Fischer, *Bibl* 72 (1991) 474-99.

143. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, II,* 655; cf. *GK,* §131k.

144. *HAL,* I, 200, 249.

with attempts to refuse: "If they refuse to accept the cup from your hand to drink, then you shall say to them: Thus says Yahweh of hosts: You must drink *(šāṯô ṯištû)*."[145] This demand is supported by an argument *a minori ad maius* (probably reflecting and rejecting a popular perversion of the notion of election; cf. Am. 3:2; 6:1-2; 9:7,10): if even Jerusalem (identified in Dtr language) must drink, so much the more the nations (v. 29). The same thought is expressed in similar words in Jer. 49:12: "If those who do not deserve to drink the cup *('ᵃšer-'ên mišpāṭām lištôṯ hakkôs)* still have to drink it," then Edom certainly must. The punishment is stated twice as being forced to "drink," emphasized by the infinitive absolute and without a direct object: *šāṯô yištû — kî šāṯōh tišteh.*

Jer. 51:7 explains the crushing power of Babylon, which poses a problem for a theological interpretation of history: "Babylon was/is a golden cup in Yahweh's hand; it made all the earth drunken. Nations drank of its wine; therefore nations have gone mad *(yiṯhōlᵉlû)*" (cf. 25:16). Misguided attempts to emend the well-attested text do not affect the "drinking"[146] and are superfluous if the unconventional theology of history (already difficult for contemporaries to understand) is taken at face value (51:8-10).[147] "The cup in the hand of Yahweh" (Ps. 75:9[8]; cf. Isa. 63:2; Jer. 22:24) is almost a technical term: instrument of punishment, realization of the inexorable causality of God (cf. Jer. 51:11-14,20-23; Zec. 12:2[148]). No one "drinks" willingly — not even the nations (Jer. 51:7bα). But even Babylon itself cannot escape (51:1-10; cf. 50:28).

To the allegory of Oholah and Oholibah (Ezk. 23:1-27) an additional threat has been added (23:31-34), introduced by the statement: "You [Oholibah] have gone the way of your sister; therefore I will press her cup into your hand" (v. 31). The fully developed cup metaphor is placed in God's mouth, with an introductory messenger formula and a concluding divine utterance formula: "You shall drink your sister's cup . . . you shall drink it and drain it out" (vv. 32,34). God's words begin and end with "drinking." In between, the "cup" appears four times as a noun and twice as a pronoun, as its nature and consequences are detailed alternately, with increasing power. Only the problematic v. 32bα interrupts the pattern for a moment.[149] In this threat the cup represents all the horrors that have befallen Israel and await Judah (vv. 28-30,35).

In Isa. 51:17-23, an oracle of comfort for Zion/Jerusalem, "cup" and "drinking" again refer to God's accomplished judgment: "you who have drunk from the hand of Yahweh the cup of his wrath [cf. Jer. 25:15], who have drunk to the dregs the bowl [cup] of staggering" (v. 17).[150] The detailed description of the suffering that is drawing to a close (vv. 18-20; cf. Ezk. 23:32-34) ends with an allusion to the cup metaphor:

---

145. McKane, *Jeremiah,* I, 642.

146. *BHS;* Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT, II,* 841-42.

147. A. Marx, "A propos des doublets du livre de Jérémie," in J. A. Emerton, ed., *Prophecy. FS G. Fohrer. BZAW* 150 (1980), 112, 117-18.

148. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Zacharja 1–8 — Zacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 216-21.

149. See *BHS.*

150. On the doublet *kôs/qubba'aṯ* see Avishur, *Stylistic Studies*, 374-75.

will fall, "all the wicked of the earth" — appear to lend it special emphasis with reference to the message of v. 8(7) (cf. 1 S. 2:7).

b. The notion of the "cup in the hand of Yahweh" is implicit in the phrase "poisoned water," found only in Jeremiah (Jer. 8:14; 9:14[15]; 23:15).[156] The earliest text is probably 23:15, a threat spoken against the *nᵉḇîʾîm:* "I am going to make them eat *laʿănâ* and make them drink *mê-rōʾš*." In 9:14(15), in almost identical words, the MT threatens "this people" with exile. In 8:14 a group imperiled by warfare recognizes and confesses: "He has given us poisoned water to drink *(wayyašqēnû mê-rōʾš),* because we have sinned against Yahweh." These words are preceded by two forms of a verb meaning "destroy": *wᵉniddᵉmâ//yhwh hăḏimmānû.*[157] Like *šth* in Ob. 16, *šqh* here seals the catastrophe brought about by God, but without the universal, eschatological perspective of Obadiah.[158]

7. *Summary.* The association of drinking *(šth/šqh)* with catastrophe, suffered or imposed, with a feast as its setting and a cup as the instrument of divine judgment on human beings (cf. Jer. 25:29: *rʿʿ* hiphil with God as subject, a hapax legomenon), is not found elsewhere in the ancient Near East.[159] In the OT, however, these elements constitute a single complex. The metaphors, especially the metaphor of the cup, appear hackneyed from the first, suggesting frequent use (in speech). The driving force that produced these idioms may well be a combination of related ideas: the necessity of water, its essential role, coupled with a certain flexibility in using and providing it. Drinking is perceived as an action that is both constrained and free. Everyone is familiar with the pleasures and bad experiences associated with intoxicating beverages and the danger of poison. Whatever is drunk is assimilated irreversibly. The damage is irreparable. There is a certain physical identification with what is drunk, whether in accordance with or contrary to common expectations concerning God's ordinances (e.g., Job 15:16; 21:20; 34:7). Ps. 109:17-19 speaks of "blessing" only as a negative contrast: "He [the wicked man] clothed himself with cursing *(qᵉlālâ)* like a garment; may it soak into his body like water, like oil into his bones" (v. 18).[160] According to Lev. 11:34,38, uncleanness in food is spread by water (cf. Nu. 5:22,24,27; Ezk. 23:33; Job 34:7). An intoxicated individual is helpless, compromised by hubris.

The notion of refusing God's cup is a first step toward thematizing the relationship between the power of God and personal human responsibility. But drinking from the cup given by God is not simply and exclusively an inescapable physical catastrophe. Subjective responsibility toward God is not ruled out from the start. These complementary beginnings are not formulated in detail or mutually balanced, but neither is one sacrificed to the other (cf. Jer. 25:28; also, e.g., Nah. 3:11 [without *šth/šqh*]).

156. Dahood, *RSP,* III, 57.

157. On the qal and hiphil of *dmm* III, see *HAL,* I, 226; McKane, *Jeremiah,* I, 190-91.

158. → H.-J. Fabry, VIII, 277.

159. Von Soden, 193.

160. O. Loretz, *Psalmen II: 90–150. AOAT* 207/2 (1979), 154-55.

VIII. Later Developments.

1. *LXX.* In the LXX *pínein* most often represents the qal of *šth* (some 200 times); occasionally it represents the niphal of *šth* (Lev. 11:34; Sir. 31:28-29) or Aram. *šᵉṯâ* (Dnl. 5:1,3-4,23; one exception: Dnl. 5:2 [LXX *oinochoḗsai,* Theod. *pínein*]). For the hiphil of *šqh,* the LXX most often uses *potízein* (related etymologically to *pínein*) with a double accusative (56 times, including Sir. 15:3). Only in Gen. 24:19a does the LXX use *pínein* for *šqh* hiphil, probably an example of polite modification influenced by the conclusion of the verse: the text does not want to leave the impression that the girl decides that enough has been drunk (*klh* piel), but the guest himself decides *(héōs epaúsato pínōn).* An interpretive element is introduced when the translation speaks not of the act of drinking itself but of its reason or occasion: *dochḗ* 8 times for *mišteh* (in Esther), *gámos* 3 times, and *kṓthōn* once (Est. 8:17).

The semantic field in the LXX is essentially identical with that in the Hebrew OT. The greater lexical variety of Greek has stylistic rather than theological consequences. If I may state an overall impression without discussing particular passages, the LXX deploys the inherently nontheological lexemes on the basis of everyday usage, without burdening them with specific semantic overtones. For example, the common vb. *katapínein* is so defined semantically that it never represents *šth/šqh* but instead translates various stems of *bl'* (29 out of 33 times) — usually in a negative sense but occasionally positively, as when God "swallows up" death (Isa. 25:8) and human wisdom (Ps. 106[MT 107]:27; cf. 1 Cor. 15:54; 2 Cor. 5:4).

2. *Intertestamental Literature.* The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha speak of drinking primarily in scenes, motifs, and aphorisms taken from the OT, occasionally expanded and clothed in fantastic imagery, usually with a parenetic and ethical bent.[161] In Pss. Sol. 8:15, in a lament over the destruction of Jerusalem (probably under Pompey), we find allusions to Jer. 25:15 and Ps. 75:9(8) (cf. Isa. 19:14; 51:17-23). Among the more original variations, note the following: Cain drinks the blood of Abel (L.A.E. 2:2-3), spirits neither eat nor drink (T. Abr. 1:4,9; cf. Tob. 12:13), God comes to deliver the land "as a man eating and drinking with men" (T. Ash. 7:3), envy begrudges food and drink (T. Sim. 3:2). The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs frequently use *pínō* in warnings against wine and sexual dissipation, particularly with reference to the episode of Ham (Gen. 9:20-24) and the Judah affair (Gen. 38). Alcoholism and its consequences are associated with the sin of Adam (3 Bar. 4:16-17).

The cup metaphor reappears as the "cup of death/poison" (e.g., T. Abr. 1:1,3; 13:12; 16:11-12; 17:16; 19:6,16; Jos. Asen. 8:5; 21:14), the "cup of blessing" (Jos. Asen. 8:5; 19:5), and the "cup of wisdom" (21:21). Surprising is the extended formula "the bread of life and the cup of immortality" (or the like; 8:9; 15:5; 16:16; 19:5).[162] In a reversal of Jer. 25:15ff. and similar texts, God hands Ezra a cup full of something that appears

---

161. A. M. Denis, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d'AT* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987), xvii.

162. A. M. Denis, *Intro. aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'AT* (Leiden, 1970), 40-48.

שָׁתַל *šāṯal*; *שָׁתִיל **šāṯîl*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and Meaning: 1. Verb; 2. Noun. III. Theological Usage. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. The root *štl* is represented in many of the Semitic languages,[1] e.g., in Akkadian by *satālu*, "plant,"[2] and *šitlu(m)*, "shoot."[3] In the West Semitic languages it may appear only in Punic.[4] Aramaic has the verbal root *šᵉṯal* and its derivatives *šeṯel*, "plant, seedling," and *šattālā'*, "planter, gardener."[5] The lexeme also appears in Syriac and Mandaic. Mand. *šitla* means "plant, child";[6] Arab. *šatla* means "seedling, cutting."[7] The verb may appear in the Punic form transcribed in Greek as *sithilesade*,[8] interpreted by Nöldeke as *šᵉṯîlê śāḏeh*.[9] It is probably a late addition to the lexical stock of Biblical Hebrew, where it appears only in poetic texts. Unlike *nṭ'*,[10] it was apparently not used in everyday language. There is no instance of *štl* in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Rabbinic literature employs a strange wordplay to connect the name Shealtiel (1 Ch. 3:17; Hag. 1:1; etc.; Ezr. 3:2; etc.; Neh. 12:1) with *štl* in the sense of "give birth." In Bab. *Sanh.* 37b we read: "[He was called] Shealtiel because God planted him *(šaṯlô-'ēl)* differently from others that are planted; tradition has it that a woman cannot conceive while standing, but his [mother] conceived standing"; "i.e., her prison cell was so narrow that she could not lie down."[11] Midr. Lev. Rab. 10.8.1 interprets the name thus: "[He was called] Shealtiel because by him the royal dignity of the Davidic house was propagated *(hwštlh)*."[12]

II. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *Verb.* The vb. *štl* occurs 10 times in the OT; in one instance, Hos. 9:13, the text is uncertain. It always takes as its object mature plants or trees (cf. Jer. 17:8//Ps. 1:3) such as grapevines (*gep̱en*, Ezk. 17:8,10), date palms (*tāmār*, Ps. 92:13-14[Eng. 12-13]), ce-

---

→ נטע *nāṭa'*

1. *HAL*, II, 1670.
2. *AHw*, II, 1033.
3. *AHw*, III, 1251.
4. T. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 57 (1903) 417; no citations in *DISO* or *WUS*.
5. *WTM*, IV, 618.
6. *MdD*, 464.
7. Wehr, 455.
8. Dioscorides 3.66.
9. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 57 (1903) 417.
10. J. Reindl, → IX, 393.
11. Cited from L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, VII (Berlin, 1925), 152, with n. 149.
12. Cited from A. Wünsche, *Der Midrasch Wajikra Rabba. Bibliotheca Rabbinica* 5 (Hildesheim, 1967), 66.

dars (*'erez,* Ezk. 17:22-23; Ps. 92:13-14[12-13]), or olive shoots (*šᵉṯîl zêṯîm,* Ps. 128:3[13]). For (trans)planting to succeed, there must be an abundance of water (Jer. 17:8//Ps. 1:3; Ezk. 17:8; 19:10);[14] the opposite situation is described in Ezk. 17:10; 19:13. The natural association of planting and water is given a religious twist when the site is a high and lofty mountain (Ezk. 17:22, referring to Mt. Zion) or "the courts of our God" (Ps. 92:14[13]). On the latter, Kraus comments: "The צדיקים are planted in the sanctuary area like the trees that obviously stood in the courts of the temple. Even today cypresses and olive trees still grow in the area of the Dome of the Rock."[15]

2. *Noun.* The derived noun *šāṯîl,* also found in Aramaic,[16] occurs in Ps. 128:3 in the phrase *šᵉṯilê zêṯîm,* "olive shoots," an image describing the sons of a family. Dalman comments: "It sometimes happens that around an aging tree, whose trunk finally has to be cut down, some of the shoots arising from the roots are encouraged to grow; when they are mature, they are grafted, so that a small circle of young olive trees grows up around the stump of the old tree. This image recalls Ps. 128:3, although the children sitting around the table may be likened to olive shoots only because they owe their birth to one mother, just as the shoots come from one tree."[17]

Sir. 50:12 describes the sons of the high priest Simon as *štyly 'rzym,* "cedar shoots."[18]

III. Theological Usage. If we examine the theological relevance of the verb, we observe that Yahweh is always in the background of the "planting" imagery. In Ezekiel's images Yahweh is clearly the subject in Ezk. 17:22-23; he is also the implicit subject of the passive forms in 17:8,10; 19:10. In the images of the devotee of the law (Ps. 1:2-3) and the individual who trusts in Yahweh (Jer. 17:8), it can only be Yahweh who visibly rewards the faithfulness of whoever worships him, represented by the image of a tree that always stays green and never ceases to bear fruit.

IV. LXX. The LXX uses *(kata)phyteúein* (also used for *nṭ'*) to translate *štl* in Ezk. 17:22-23; 19:10; Ps. 1:3; 92:14(13); it similarly uses *neóphytos* for *šᵉṯîl* in Ps. 128:3. In Jer. 17:8, however, the LXX uses *euthēneín* for *štl* and in Ezk. 17:8,10 *piaínein.* In Sir. 50:12 *blástēma* is used for *šᵉṯîl.*

Beyse

13. See II.2 below.

14. J. Reindl, → IX, 393; F. N. Hepper, *Baker Encyclopedia of Bible Plants* (Grand Rapids, 1992), 97, 103, describes the irrigation of vines and olive trees.

15. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 230.

16. See I above.

17. G. Dalman, *AuS,* IV (1935), 174-75; a similar description is given by Hepper, *Bible Plants,* 107.

18. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin, 1906), 90.

תְּאֵנָה *tᵉʾēnâ*

I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. General; 2. Tree; 3. Fruit. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. In all probability Heb. *tᵉʾēnâ,* "fig tree, fig," is a primary noun cognate with Akk. *tittu* (pl. *tinātu*);[1] Pun. *tyn;*[2] Imperial Aram. *tyn;* Jewish Aram. *tʾnh, tînᵉtāʾ;*[3] Syr. *tettāʾ* (pl. *tēʾnē*); Mand. *tina;*[4] and Arab. *tīn.* The word occurs 38 times in the OT, distributed relatively evenly among the various literary genres.

II. Usage.

1. *General.* The fig tree *(Ficus carica)* is mentioned as one of the most important cultivated flora of Palestine (e.g., Nu. 13:23; Dt. 8:8 — along with grapes and pomegranates).[5] The tree produces two crops each year. The first fruit is set in April, before the appearance of foliage (cf. Mk. 13:28 par.); even such unripe fruit (*paggîm,* Cant. 2:3) is edible. The first ripe figs (*bikkûrâ,* Isa. 28:4; Jer. 24:2; Hos. 9:10; Mic. 7:1) appear in June, from plantings set out in the fall; they are delicious and very popular. Autumn figs *(tᵉʾēnâ)* are harvested from August through October.

2. *Tree.* a. After the fall, Adam and Eve try to make their first clothing out of fig leaves (Gen. 3:7). Whether the lobate form of these leaves made them particularly unsuitable for this purpose[6] or their size made them particularly suitable (as many think) may be left an open question.

In the land of Canaan, to which Yahweh is bringing his people, fig trees grow alongside grapevines and olive trees (Dt. 8:8); the spies bring back grapes, pomegranates, and figs when they return from the land (Nu. 13:23). The wilderness, by contrast, is no place for these gifts of God (Nu. 20:5; the worshipers of Baal in Hos. 2:14[Eng. 12] consider them the gifts of "their lovers").

---

tᵉʾēnâ. G. Dalman, *AuS,* I/1 (1928), esp. 99-100, 257; I/2 (1928), esp. 378-79; H. Giesen, "Feige," *NBL,* I, 662; idem, "Feigenbaum," *NBL,* I, 662-63; C.-H. Hunzinger, "συκῆ," *TDNT,* VII, 751-59; S. Klein, "Weinstock, Feigenbaum und Sykomore in Palästina," *FS A. Schwarz* (Berlin, 1918), 389-402, esp. 396-99; H. N. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (1952, repr. New York, 1986), esp. 103-6; F. Olck, "Feige," *PW,* VI, 2100-2151; B. Pípal, "Sie machten sich Schurze, Gen 3,7," *Krestanske Revue* 29 (1962) 38-39; A. E. Rüthy, *Die Pflanze und ihre Teile im biblisch-hebräischen Sprachgebrauch* (Bern, 1942); M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (London, 1982), esp. 58-59.

1. *AHw,* III, 1363.
2. *DISO,* 327; *KAI* 76B.5.
3. *DISO,* 323; *ANH*³, 441.
4. *MdD,* 486.
5. I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden,* I (Vienna, 1924), 224-54; Dalman.
6. H. Holzinger, *Genesis. KHC* I (1898), 32.

It is a great misfortune when fig trees and grapevines (and occasionally other fruit trees) are destroyed by enemies or a natural catastrophe, or fail to bear fruit. According to Hos. 2:14(12), Yahweh will lay them waste as a punishment for idolatry; in Joel 1:7,12, and Am. 4:9, locusts have destroyed them; in Jer. 5:17 they are laid waste by enemies (prophecy of divine punishment). According to Jer. 8:13, the failure of the crop is a punishment sent by God; similarly in Hab. 3:17, in the context of a lament. According to Hag. 2:19, the fig tree yields nothing because the temple has not been rebuilt. In Ps. 105, a survey of Israel's history, destruction of fruit trees was one of the plagues of Egypt (v. 33). When the land is restored, conversely, fig trees and vines will give their full yield (Joel 2:22). In the context of the destruction of Edom, Isa. 34:4 describes the host of heaven as withering like leaves on a vine or fruit on a fig tree.

b. Sitting under one's own vine and fig tree is an image of peace and security (1 K. 5:5[4:25]; Mic. 4:4; Zec. 3:10), as is the chance to eat the fruit of the vine and the fig tree (2 K. 18:31//Isa. 36:16). In Prov. 27:18 this image illustrates the connection between actions and consequences: "Anyone who tends a fig tree will eat its fruit."

c. The fable of Jotham (Jgs. 9:7-15) is a special case. The fig tree is one of the trees that refuse the request of the other trees to reign over them: "Shall I stop producing my sweetness and my delicious fruit, and go to sway over the trees?"

3. *Fruit.* a. Pressed figs were made into cakes *(dᵉḇēlâ),* especially to serve as food for a journey (1 S. 25:18; 30:12; 1 Ch. 12:41; Jth. 10:5). According to Isa. 38:21//2 K. 20:7, a paste made from such cakes was applied to a boil on Hezekiah's skin to heal it.

b. Jer. 24:1-10 describes a vision of two baskets of figs. One contains "very good figs, like first-ripe figs *(t*ᵉ*'ēnê habbakkurôṯ),*" the other very bad *(rā'ôṯ)* figs. The good figs symbolize the exiles from Judah, the bad figs those who remained behind in Jerusalem. The same image appears in Jer. 29:17, in the prophet's letter to the exiles, which describes the inhabitants of Jerusalem as rotten figs that cannot be eaten.

c. Nah. 3:12 compares the fortresses of Nineveh to first-ripe figs *(bikkûrîm),* which fall with ease when the tree is shaken.

d. Neh. 13:15-22 attacks the failure to obey the Sabbath commandment: on the Sabbath people tread winepresses and sells wine, grapes, figs, and other commodities in Jerusalem — obviously everyday necessities.

III. 1. *LXX.* Depending on the meaning in each text, the LXX translates *t*ᵉ*'ēnâ* with either *sykḗ* (24 times)/*sykṓn* (bis), "fig tree," or *sýkon,* "fig" (12 times).

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *t'nh* occurs 3 or 4 times. The text of 4Q378 11 6 (restored) follows the description of the land in Dt. 8:8. Here, and in 4Q365a 2 1:3, *t'nym* parallels *rmwnym.* In 4Q379 26 1 *ht'*[*ny*]*m* is a possible reading, but there is no extant context. Finally, the purchase contract Mur 30:18 uses *t'nym* in describing what has been sold.

Ringgren

תֹּאַר *tō'ar;* תאר *t'r*

I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Usage. III. Sirach. IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. The vb. *t'r* I is found in only one OT text: Isa. 44:13, with reference to the manufacture of idols. Here it occurs twice in the piel and means "sketch, mark out."[1] Jenni sees behind these meanings the common element "make contours."[2]

The boundary descriptions in Joshua use a vb. *t'r* II (qal); it clearly means "make a bend." It appears in this sense in Josh. 15:9,11; 18:14,17; 19:13 (cj.),[3] obviously as a technical term for a "conspicuous change in the direction of a boundary"[4] separating two tribes at a prominent landmark. Thus this term belongs theologically to the lexical field of the tribal territories and their boundaries, behind which stands the effort to describe the land and the portions allotted to the tribes as precisely as possible, so as to make visible on a map the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise.[5]

The noun *tō'ar,* "form, appearance," occurs 15 times (plus 6 times in Sirach). It is impossible to determine whether the verb is a denominative from the noun or *tō'ar* derives from the verbal root. A derivation from *r'h* (with transposition), "see,"[6] has not found much support. Neither does a derivation from *twr,* "spy out,"[7] appear cogent.

A noun *t'r* is attested in Phoenician. The Eshmunazar inscription states that whoever opens the tomb and removes its bones will have neither root nor fruit nor *t'r* among those who live under the sun.[8] Here *t'r* appears to be tantamount to "honor," a meaning that seems to derive from the magnificent appearance (of the tree).[9] Therefore Dahood has proposed the meaning "beauty."[10] Greenfield is not happy with the meaning "fine appearance," suggesting that a "transcendental quality" is implied.[11]

There are two Neo-Punic occurrences.[12] In the first, Donner and Röllig[13] suggest

---

tō'ar. D. J. Kamhi, "The Term *tō'ar* in Hebrew and Its Status as a Grammatical Category," *BSOAS* 34 (1971) 257-72.

1. *HAL,* II, 1676.
2. *HP,* 214.
3. See *BHS.*
4. O. Bächli, *ZDPV* 89 (1973) 1-14, esp. 8.
5. M. Sæbø, *ZDPV* 90 (1974) 14-37.
6. *GesB,* 869.
7. P. Haupt, *FS W. R. Harper,* II (Chicago, 1908), 134.
8. *KAI* 14.12.
9. Y. Avishur, *UF* 8 (1976) 5-6.
10. M. Dahood, "Phoenician Elements in Isaiah 52:13–53:12," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 66.
11. J. C. Greenfield, "Scripture and Inscription," in ibid., 253-68, esp. 265.
12. *KAI* 119.7; 138.5.
13. *KAI,* II, 124, 137.

the meaning "honor"; the latter clearly has to do with the "form" of the altars.[14] Tomback interprets these texts in an entirely different sense, proposing the meaning "clan, extended family" on the basis of a different etymology.[15] Finally, there is a fem. PN *t'r'*.[16]

The root also appears in Aramaic dialects, including Christian Palestinian *t'r,* "examine, consider,"[17] and Syr. *ta'ar,* "note, perceive," as well as Arab. *ta'ara* with *'ilā,* "stare at."[18]

II. Usage. With the meaning "form, figure," *tō'ar* can be used in an entirely neutral sense, as in 1 S. 28:14: when the medium at Endor has conjured up the spirit of Samuel, Saul asks, "What is his *tō'ar?*" i.e., "What does he look like?" In the great majority of cases, however, the word expresses a positive or (more rarely) negative judgment. Gideon's brothers, who had been killed by Zebah and Zalmunna, looked like sons of a king (Jgs. 8:18). Saul praises David as an *'îš tō'ar,* a man of (fine) figure (1 S. 16:18). David's son Adonijah is *ṭôḇ-tō'ar mᵉ'ōḏ,* "of very excellent figure" (1 K. 1:6). The noun is often used in combination with *yāp̱eh,* "beautiful, comely." For example, the Dtr law envisions the case of a man who finds among the prisoners of war a woman "comely of figure" (*yᵉp̱aṯ-tō'ar,* Dt. 21:11); Abigail is described as *ṭôḇaṯ-śeḵel wîp̱aṯ tō'ar,* "fine of mind and comely of figure" (1 S. 25:3).

We often find *tō'ar* paired with *mar'eh,* "appearance." Joseph is "comely in form and appearance" (Gen. 39:6); similarly, in contrast to Leah, Rachel is *yᵉp̱aṯ-tō'ar wîp̱aṯ mar'eh* (Gen. 29:17). Esther, finally, is described in the same terms (Est. 2:7). The servant of God in Deutero-Isaiah is described in opposite terms: his *tō'ar* was not that of mortals, he looked inhuman (Isa. 52:14), he had no *tō'ar* and no *hāḏār* ("majesty, beauty") (53:2), so that there was nothing pleasing in his appearance. Elsewhere *hāḏār* generally refers to royal majesty; the Psalms often apply it to Yahweh (e.g., Ps. 104:1).[19]

In Lam. 4:8 *tō'ar* has negative connotations: the princes of Zion were once white as milk and snow, ruddy as coral; now their aspect *(tō'ar)* is blacker than soot. Thus has the glory of Zion been transformed.

We also find *tō'ar* used in the description of the cows seen by Pharaoh in his dream: the first were well nourished and lovely in *tō'ar;* the others were scrawny and ugly *(rā'ôṯ)* in *tō'ar* (Gen. 41:18-19). Finally *tō'ar* appears in Jer. 11:16: once Israel was an olive tree, fair with goodly fruit *(yᵉp̱ēh pᵉrî-ṯō'ar);*[20] now, however, Yahweh who planted it has pronounced evil against it.

---

14. See also *DISO,* 323.
15. Tomback, 337.
16. Benz, 185, 427-28.
17. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 217.
18. Lane, I/1, 292.
19. G. Warmuth, → III, 335-41, esp. 337-38.
20. On this phrase see Avishur, *UF* 8 (1976) 5-6.

III. Sirach. The 6 occurrences of *tō'ar* in Sirach are all quite different. Sir. 11:2 cautions against judging individuals on the basis of their looks or appearance. In 16:1 we read: "Do not wish for comely *(tō'ar)* children if they are worthless." According to 42:12, a father should not allow his daughter to parade her *tō'ar* (beauty) before a man. The text of 42:25 and 43:9 is corrupt. Finally, 43:9 calls the stars the *tō'ar* (beauty) and *hāḏār* (glory) of the heavens.

IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. The usual LXX translation is *eídos,* but once *ópsis* is used. In 1 S. 28:14 the LXX paraphrases. In Sirach *kállos* is used 3 times and *eídos* once; twice we find paraphrases.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls *t'r* appears only in 4Q525 14 1:12 *(tw'rkh);* the fragmentary text provides no context.

Ringgren

תֵּבָה *tēḇâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. LXX and Vulgate. II. Noah's Ark: 1. Description; 2. Background; 3. Religious Significance; 4. Dead Sea Scrolls. III. Moses' Ark: 1. Description; 2. Background; 3. Religious Significance. IV. Summary.

I. 1. *Etymology. HAL*[1] rightly states that in Hebrew there is only one noun תֵּבָה and that it is an Egyptian loanword,[2] even though we cannot say with certainty[3] whether it reflects Egyp. *ḏbȝt,* "reliquary, coffin,"[4] or (more likely) *tb.t,* "box."[5]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *tēḇâ* occurs 28 times in the OT: 26 times in Gen. 6–9 and twice in Ex. 2. It occurs 14 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

tēḇâ. C. Cohen, "Hebrew *tbh:* Proposed Etymologies," *JANES* 4 (1972) 36-51; M. Harl, "Le nom de l'arche de Noé dans la Septante," *Alexandrina. FS C. Mondésert* (Paris, 1987), 15-41; R. Largement, "Le thème de l'arche dans les traditions suméro-semitiques," *Mélanges bibliques. FS A. Robert* (Paris, 1957), 60-65; A. Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark* (Eng. tr. New York, 1955); H. Graf Reventlow, "Arche," *BHHW,* I, 125; E. Ullendorff, "The Construction of Noah's Ark," *VT* 4 (1954) 95-96; P. Weimar, "Arche," *NBL,* I, 160-61.

1. *HAL,* II, 1677-78.
2. Contra H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter* (Leipzig, 1917), 45: *elippu tebîta.*
3. As pointed out also by W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 69.
4. *GesTh,* 1481.
5. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 420.

3. *Meaning.* Our word means "box"; it denotes both the ark built by Noah and the papyrus container holding the baby Moses.

4. *LXX and Vulgate.* The LXX uses *hē kibōtós* to translate the noun in the story of the deluge, but it also uses this term for the ark of the covenant. For the papyrus container in the story of Moses' birth it uses *hē thíbis.* The Vg. uses *fiscella,* "basket," for the latter and *arca* (whence Eng. "ark") for the "box" built by Noah.

II. Noah's Ark.

1. *Description.* It is generally accepted that the story of the deluge is an artful literary structure composed by R^P from two originally independent narrative stands, generally referred to as J and P.[6] The building of the ark is described only once, in Gen. 6:14-16 (P), because the parallel account of J was sacrificed.[7] P describes the ark as a large rectangular box 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high, made of coniferous wood and covered inside and out with pitch. It has three decks with cabins, a door in its side, and a skylight in its roof.[8] Thus the ark is not a ship or a shiplike vessel,[9] but a kind of houseboat,[10] "intended simply to stay afloat, not to sail."[11]

2. *Background.* That the ark belongs to a non-Israelite tradition is suggested by the fact that "there are a number of words that do not, or scarcely ever, occur again in the OT: תבה . . . , גפר, כפר, and צהר."[12] The special vocabulary was borrowed along with the narrative material. The similarity to tablet 11 of Gilgamesh points to the Sumerian-Babylonian region. But the Sumerian account uses *ma-gar,* "enormous ship," and the Babylonian account has *elippu rabītu,* "large ship," whereas the OT uses the Egyptian term for "box." It follows that P is not literarily dependent on the Mesopotamian tradition: either both this tradition and P go back to a common ancestor, now lost,[13] or P draws on a tradition that developed within Israel, incorporating Egyptian elements.[14]

3. *Religious Significance.* In P the religious significance of the ark is illustrated by the "solemn procession"[15] of Noah, his family, and the animals when they enter and exit the ark. The ark is accorded the status of a cultic site, and the preservation of those within it is understood as a cultic act initiated by God. This observation accords with the fact that the ark preserved Noah and his fellow passengers on account of their faith-

---

6. Ibid., 424-25.
7. Ibid., 449; G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. tr. ^{2}1972), 119-20.
8. Parrot, 19; L. Ruppert, *Genesis. FzB* 70 (1992), 327-28.
9. Contra O. Procksch, *Genesis. KAT* I (^{3}1924), 470.
10. Von Rad, *Genesis,* 127.
11. *RHB,* I, 264.
12. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 420.
13. Ibid.; also von Rad, *Genesis,* 123-24.
14. J. Skinner, *Genesis. ICC* (1910), 177-78.
15. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 436, 452.

ful obedience.[16] The deliverance of humanity in the form of a family[17] is an expression of OT anthropology; the covenant following emergence from the ark is a form of divine assurance that merely "guarantees continuation of the world."[18] The ark serves as the locus and instrument for preserving faithful Noah from the catastrophe of the deluge. This is also the symbolic significance of the ark in the Judeo-Christian tradition.

4. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The occurrences of the noun in the Dead Sea Scrolls all refer to the ark of Noah. The entrance into the ark two by two in CD 5:1 (bis) reflects Gen. 7:9; 1QapGen 10:12 cites Gen. 8:4; and the 11 occurrences in 4Q252-254 = 4QpGen[a-c] (4Q252 1 1:10,13,15,21; 2:2,4; 4Q253 1 4; 4Q254 15 2,7[bis],9) all refer to Gen. 6–9.

III. Moses' Ark.

1. *Description.* Unlike Noah's ark, the container holding Moses is made of papyrus (*gōme'* = Egyp. *ḳmꜣ*) and plastered with bitumen and pitch (Ex. 2:3). It can float on the Nile and eventually becomes lodged among the reeds (*sûp̱*, v. 5).

2. *Background.* The words used here are Egyptian loanwords; the narrative exhibits local Egyptian color.[19] As the "closest parallel," Schmidt[20] cites the story of Sargon's birth.[21]

3. *Religious Significance.* Like the story of Noah, the story of Moses' birth is dependent on other material; it too is concerned with the preservation of an individual, namely Moses. In contrast to Noah, however, the preservation of Moses is not a reward for religious conduct. It is due entirely to human actions.

IV. Summary. In each case the *tēḇâ* serves "to rescue a person crucial to the future course of history."[22] Both stories narrate something that is "not a miracle," something that is wondrous but not miraculous.[23] Schmidt decides to leave open the question whether the two legends of the "saving box" have common traditio-historical roots, although traditio-historical independence is more likely. In either case there is no justification for understanding Gen. 6 as a type for Ex. 2 and interpreting "Moses as a second Noah or Moses' deliverance of his people as a new creation."[24]

Zobel†

16. Von Rad, *Genesis,* 120; Skinner, *Genesis,* 178.
17. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 425-26.
18. Ibid., 471.
19. Schmidt, *Exodus I: 1–6. BK* II (1988), 58, 69.
20. Ibid., 57.
21. *AOT*², 234-35.
22. Schmidt, *Exodus,* 68-69.
23. Ibid., 75.
24. Ibid., 69.

תְּבוּאָה tᵉḇûʾâ

I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Literal Meaning; 2. Figurative Meaning. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. The noun *tᵉḇûʾâ* derives from → בוא *bôʾ* and means "that which comes in," hence "income, produce, yield" — particularly "harvest," but also "revenue." There is a similar word in Ugaritic: [*wl*]*brk tt tbût,* "to bless the offering of the yield."[1] An analogous semantic development may be observed in Akk. *erbu(m), irbu,* "income,"[2] from *erēbu(m),* "enter," Syr. *ʿᵃlaltā,* "fruit, yield," from *ʿal,* "enter," and Arab. *ġallat,* "firstfruits, profit, yield," from *ġalla,* "enter."[3]

The word occurs 42 times; it appears also in the SP and LXX versions of Ex. 22:4(Eng. 5) and Sir. 6:19, and possibly Am. 6:1bβ.[4] Of these occurrences, 18 are in P,[5] including 11 in H (9 in Lev. 25; also Ex. 23:10, in the same context), 5 in Deuteronomy (Dt. 33:14 E?), and 8 in Proverbs.

In construct phrases the following nouns appear as *nomen rectum* with *tᵉḇûʾâ: ʾᵃḏāmâ, ʾereṣ, gōren, dāgān, zeraʿ, yeqeḇ, kerem, śāḏeh, śᵉpāṯayim,* and *šemeš;* the following appear as *nomen regens: maʿᵃśēr, pᵉrî, rēʾšîṯ,* and (metaphorically) *saḥar.* Related nouns in the lexical field include above all *pᵉrî* (also with *ʾᵃḏāmâ, ʾereṣ, kerem, śāḏeh*), *yᵉḇûl* (also with *ʾᵃḏāmâ, ʾereṣ*), and *qāṣîr.*

II. Usage.

1. *Literal Meaning.* a. In legal contexts *tᵉḇûʾâ* denotes the produce of a field. When a field is sold it remains in the possession of the purchaser only until the following Jubilee Year; then it returns to its original owner. The selling price is determined by the number of "crop years" (*šᵉnê-ṯᵉḇûʾōṯ,* Lev. 25:15; shortened to *mispar ṯᵉḇûʾōṯ* in v. 16). During the 7 years of famine, the Egyptian farmers are forced to sell their land to Pharaoh; as tenants, they are to give one-fifth of the harvest *(tᵉḇûʾōṯ)* to Pharaoh (Gen. 47:24). In Ezekiel's vision the produce of the land surrounding the Levitical cities is to be food for the workers of the city (Ezk. 48:18).

In Ex. 22:4(5) the SP and LXX (and also 4Q158) include an addition stating that someone whose livestock grazes over someone else's field is to make restitution from the produce of his own field (MT says simply "from the best of his field").[6]

b. In cultic contexts in one way or another the produce of the land is to be recog-

1. *KTU* 1.15, V, 11; cited from J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *UF* 14 (1982) 179.

2. *AHw,* I, 233-34.

3. Wehr, 679; cf. *HAL,* II, 1679.

4. W. L. Holladay, *VT* 22 (1972) 107-10.

5. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 261 n. 54; always with reference to the harvest: 322 n. 33.

6. A. Toeg, *Tarbiz* 39 (1969/70) 223-31, 419.

nized as God's gift. The beginning of the Festival of Booths is set by Lev. 23:39 as the fifteenth day of the seventh month, the time when the produce of the land *(tᵉḇû'aṯ hā'āreṣ)* is harvested. Dt. 16:13 speaks of a threshing floor and a winepress, but does not use the word *tᵉḇû'â.* V. 15, however, associates the festival with the rejoicing of the farmers because God has blessed their produce and their labor.

The laws governing the Sabbatical Year (Ex. 23:10-11; Lev. 25:2-7) require that field *(śāḏeh)* and vineyard *(kerem)* be cultivated for six years and their produce harvested; in the seventh year whatever grows of its own accord (*tᵉḇû'â,* Lev. 25:7) is allotted to slaves, partial citizens, and animals. After seven sabbath cycles, the fiftieth year is celebrated as a Jubilee Year; fields and vineyards remain uncultivated. But Yahweh promises to bless the land in the sixth year so that it yields a triple crop *('āśâ tᵉḇû'â,* Lev. 25:20-21).[7] During the eighth year one can still eat "the old crop *(tᵉḇû'â)*," until the harvest comes in the ninth year (v. 22; secondary[8]).

The laws governing the mixing of species *(kil'ayim)* include a ban on planting other plants in a vineyard; if a second kind of seed is planted, the whole yield is forfeited to the sanctuary *(tiqdaš),* both the crop sown and the yield of the vineyard (*tᵉḇû'aṯ hakkerem,* Dt. 22:9; cf. Lev. 19:19). The prohibition may be directed against alien magical or cultic practices,[9] or it may be based on practical considerations.[10]

Dt. 14:22 requires that every year a tithe[11] be brought from all the yield of the seed *(tᵉḇû'aṯ zar'eḵā)* that the field produces *(yôṣē' śāḏeh).* The tithe is to be eaten "in the presence of Yahweh" (v. 23), so that the people may learn to fear God. Every third year "the full tithe of the produce" is allotted to the Levites and the poor (vv. 28-29). According to Nu. 18:21-32, the Levites receive the tithe of the yield of fields and vineyards, of which they give "the best" *(ḥeleḇ)* to "the priest Aaron" as an offering *(tᵉrûmâ),* a "tithe of the tithe" (vv. 25-32). The remainder then goes to the Levites, as though it were the produce of their own fields and vineyards (v. 30). Each Levite and his household may eat it anywhere, as payment for his service at the tent of meeting. In 2 Ch. 31:5 we find an account of how this law was fulfilled in the time of Hezekiah. One passage in Proverbs (3:9-10) alludes to such a cultic offering: "Honor Yahweh . . . with the firstfruits *(rē'šîṯ)* of all your produce, that barns and winepresses may be filled" with the gifts bestowed by God.[12]

The fruit of a tree is considered "uncircumcised" *('ārēl)* for the first three years; in the fourth year it is set apart as a festal offering to Yahweh. Not until the fifth year may it be eaten freely, "that the yield *(tebû'â)* may be increased" (Lev. 19:23-25).

c. Narrative texts, too, often speak of the produce of the land. After crossing the Jordan, the Israelites eat for the first time the produce (*tebû'â,* here "grain") of the land of Canaan (Josh. 5:11-12). After living in the land of the Philistines for seven years, the

---

7. Cf. M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1965), 188.
8. Ibid.
9. P. C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy. NICOT* (1976), 290.
10. A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy. NCBC* (1981), 307-8.
11. → מַעֲשֵׂר / *ma'ᵃśēr.*
12. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 293-94.

Shunammite woman returns, receives her property back at the command of the king, and is able to enjoy the produce of her field (*tᵉḇû'ōṯ haśśāḏeh,* 2 K. 8:6). Hezekiah builds storehouses for grain *(tᵉḇû'aṯ dāḡān),* wine, and oil (2 Ch. 32:28). In a prayer Nehemiah laments the evil times: the people are enslaved and the rich yield of the land goes to foreign kings (Neh. 9:37).

In the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33:14), Joseph is promised "choice fruits of the sun *(meḡeḏ tᵉḇû'ōṯ šemeš),* the rich yield of the months (*yᵉrāḥîm* — possibly 'moons,' as suggested by the parallelism)." Like the preceding verse, this is a fertility blessing, referring to bounteous harvest produced by the sun and the alternation of the seasons.[13]

According to Ps. 107:35ff., God turns the desert into a fertile land, where fields can be cultivated to produce a fruitful yield (*'āśâ pᵉrî ṯᵉḇû'â,* v. 37). Describing the fertility of the land "on that day," Isa. 30:23 says: "There will be rain . . . and bread, the produce of the ground *(tᵉḇû'aṯ hā'ᵃḏāmâ),* which will be rich and plenteous."

Less clear is the description of Tyre's commerce in Isa. 23:3. The text is corrupt;[14] it probably means that Tyre and Sidon transport the produce of the land to the Nile in order to sell it to other lands. Or it may mean that the produce of Tyre is sold on the Nile.[15]

A proverb states: "Where there are no oxen, there is no grain; abundant crops come by the strength of the ox" (Prov. 14:4). In other words, the labor of the oxen produces the harvest. Job 31:12 likens adultery to a consuming fire that uproots (or "devours to the root"[16]) the harvest of the guilty party.

The form *tᵉḇô'āṯᵉḵā* in Job 22:21 yields no sense. It should probably be emended to *tᵉḇô'ᵃḵā:* "Be his friend and be at peace; in this way good will come to you."[17]

2. *Figurative Meaning.* The word can also be used figuratively. In Jer. 2:3 Israel is holy to Yahweh as the firstfruits of his harvest *(rē'šîṯ tᵉḇû'āṯô);* all who eat of it are held guilty. It is forbidden to eat what is holy, especially the *tᵉrûmâ* (Lev. 22:10-16). According to Jer. 12:13, Israel has sown wheat and reaped thorns, but to no profit *(lō' yô'ilû);* they are disappointed at their harvest (reading *tᵉḇû'ōṯêhem*[18]).

Wisdom literature uses *tᵉḇû'â* in the sense of "profit, income." "In the house of the righteous there is much treasure, but trouble befalls the income *(tᵉḇû'â)* of the wicked" (Prov. 15:6). "Better a little with righteousness than great profit *(rōḇ tᵉḇû'ôṯ)* with injustice" (Prov. 16:8). Eccl. 5:9(10): "The lover of money will not be satisfied with money; the lover of wealth *(hāmôn)* will not be satisfied with gain"[19] — or: ". . . there

---

13. Craigie, *Deuteronomy,* 397; but cf. E. König, *Deuteronomium. KAT* III (1917), 226-27.

14. E. J. Kissane, *Isaiah,* I (²1960), 248, 250, 252; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 160.

15. A. Hakham, *Sefer Yesha'yahu. Da'at Miqra'* (Jerusalem, 1984), in loc.

16. N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 423, 425; "burns up": G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 423, 425.

17. *GK,* §48d; S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *Job. ICC,* 2 vols. (1921), II, 197; Fohrer, *Hiob,* 350-51.

18. B. Duhm, *Jeremie. KHC* XI (1901), 117-18.

19. Following W. Zimmerli, *Prediger. ATD* XVI/1 (³1980), 188 (cf. NRSV).

is no profit."[20] Prov. 10:16: "The wage *(pᵉʿullâ)* of the righteous leads to life, the income *(tᵉḇûʾâ)* of the wicked to sin" (i.e., misfortune; or, with Winton Thomas,[21] "poverty" in contrast to *ḥayyîm,* "a living").[22]

According to Prov. 3:14, the gain *(saḥar)* from wisdom is better than that of silver, and its acquisition *(tᵉḇûʾâ)* better than gold (cf. 8:19, where the fruit of wisdom and its "yield" are compared to gold and silver). In a similar vein, Sir. 6:19 says: "Go after her [sc. Wisdom] like a plower and reaper, and wait for her good harvest."

Metaphorically, *tᵉḇûʾâ* can represent speech: "By the fruit of his mouth, everyone is filled; the yield of his lips brings satisfaction" (Prov. 18:20; cf. v. 21).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX usually translates *tᵉḇûʾâ* with *génnēma* (31 times) or *karpós* (6 times). Other translations occur on occasion.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Most of the occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls are in fragmentary texts, with no recognizable context. In 1Q22 2:11 we are told that God sends rain and water so that the earth may produce her harvest. In 1Q26 — a text that exhibits affinities with the wisdom text 4Q423 — we find the words: "you will be cursed in all your gain" (1:6//4Q413 4:2; cf. also 1:3 and 2:2//4Q423 3:2). The parallel text 4Q423 contains additional occurrences: 5:7 speaks of "gathering your harvest in its season"; the context of 12:3 is fragmentary. Also fragmentary are 4Q266 12 8; 4Q299 6 2:14; 4Q419 8 2:6; 4Q493 1 14; 4Q509 17 4. In 4Q251 6 7 firstborn *(bkwr)* and *tᵉḇûʾâ* appear together. The expression *pry tbwʾ*[*h*] appears in an unidentified fragment (cf. Ps. 107:37). A festival prayer (4Q508 22-23 3) contains the words: "produce of our land as *tᵉnûp̱â*"; the context is obscure. In 4Q504 6 4 *tᵉḇûʾâ* occurs with *hiṯbônēn,* "in order to understand" (cf. also 4Q423 5 7). In 4Q381 1 6 we find the expression *kol tᵉḇûʾôṯ śāḏeh,*[23] and in 4Q418 103 2:8 *tᵉḇûʾaṯ hakkerem* (cf. Dt. 22:9). In the eschatological age of salvation, "the earth will give its fruit in its season, and its harvest will not be scant" (4QPs^{f} 9:9-11).[24] A similar image is used in 11QBer 1:11//4Q285 1 8: neither drought nor blight will afflict the harvest of the land. In short, the scrolls remain within the framework of OT usage.

Zipor

20. *HAL,* II, 1679.
21. D. Winton Thomas, *JTS* 15 (1964) 295-96.
22. Cf. McKane, *Proverbs,* 425; *BHS* reads *limḥittâ.*
23. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 29 (1986), 71, 75, 82.
24. J. Starcky, *RB* 73 (1966) 357, 367.

תֵּבֵל *tēḇēl*; תֶּבֶל *teḇel*

I. Etymology. II. 1. Meaning and Distribution; 2. Syntagms. III. Theological Foci: 1. Creation; 2. Theophany; 3. Judgment. IV. 1. Sirach; 2. LXX; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls. V. *teḇel*.

I. Etymology. The etymology of *tēḇēl* is totally obscure. The feminine noun occurs 36 times in the OT, never with an article; it may therefore be considered "inherently determinate."[1] It also occurs only in the singular. These features suggest that *tēḇēl* has acquired the character of a proper name.

Earlier scholars usually derived *tēḇēl* from a verbal root *ybl* of uncertain meaning[2] or from *bll*, "disperse" (*tēḇēl* as denoting the lands of the Diaspora outside Israel);[3] more recently, a derivation from a verbal root *'bl*,[4] "dry out," has been proposed. This root appears in Akk. *abālū(m)*, "dry out."[5] The Akkadian noun *tābalu* means "dry land";[6] it appears in the Amarna letters: *umānu lū ša tābali lū ša nāri*, "creatures of the land or of the river."[7]

This etymological connection of the noun with the verb in Akkadian might tempt one to posit a similar development from the vb. *'āḇal*, "dry out,"[8] to *tēḇēl*, "dry land."[9] Such an etymology, however, has to face the problem of the missing initial א. *HAL* proposes an internal Hebrew development from **te'bilu* to **tēbilu*, explaining the disappearance of the א by citing Bergsträsser.[10] But Bergsträsser's argumentation is insufficient to account for the disappearance of the א in this case. Therefore the etymology of the noun remains an open question; even the unlikely explanation of *tēḇēl* as a loanword from Akkadian cannot finally be rejected out of hand.[11] Might the Judahites have brought the term with them when they returned from exile? If so, why does it not ap-

---

tēḇēl. P. Doll, *Menschenschöpfung und Weltschöpfung in der alttestamentlichen Weisheit. SBS* 117 (1985); O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. tr. 1978, repr. Winona Lake, 1997); H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. FRLANT* 148 (1989); I. J. Stadelmann, *Hebrew Conception of the World. AnBibl* 39 (1970); C. Streibert, *Schöpfung bei Deuterojesaja und in der Priesterschrift. BEATAJ* 8 (1993); J. P. Weinberg, "Die Natur im Weltbild des Chronisten," *VT* 31 (1981) 324-45.

1. Meyer, II, §96.2a.
2. Cf. *BDB*, 385; *GesB*, 281.
3. *GesB*, 870; cf. already Rashi, and R. Avrohom and C. Feuer, *Tehilim*, I (New York, ^{3}1991), 297.
4. → אבל *'āḇal*.
5. *AHw*, I, 3.
6. *AHw*, III, 1298.
7. EA 10:33.
8. → I, 44-48.
9. *HAL*, II, 1682.
10. *HAL*, II, 1682; Bergstrasser, I, §15a,b.
11. H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter* (Leipzig, ^{2}1917), 43; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. tr. 1997), 26.

pear in P? In the context of creation, P uses *yabbāšâ*, "dry (land)" (Gen. 1:9-10; cf. 8:14; Ex. 14:16,22,29),[12] as the antonym of → ים *yām*, "sea," the waters under the sky. This usage establishes *yabbāšâ* as the term denoting the "dry land," while *tēḇēl* appears to be used in a different sense.

We also find *tēḇēl* in Middle Hebrew with the meaning "world";[13] it has the same sense in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls.[14] There is also an Egyptian Aramaic word *tbl'*,[15] which from its context might mean "measuring line (of a surveyor)" (Heb. *ḥeḇel*). But Bowman long ago proposed interpreting *tbl* as "dry land" in contrast to water.[16] The meaning of Phoen. *šbl* (= *tbl* I) is disputed: road? chisel? inhabited world?[17]

II. 1. *Meaning and Distribution.* When all is said and done, the primary meaning of *tēḇēl* appears to be "(dry) land," usually with emphasis on solidity and permanence.[18] It is a term belonging to the lexical field of cosmology, and can even mean "cosmos" (Ps. 50:12; 90:2). But since P, which is contemporaneous with most of the occurrences of this lexeme, uses *yabbāšâ*, *tēḇēl* must embody an additional semantic component.

The various occurrences of *tēḇēl* reveal a remarkable tension between synonymy and antonymy with → ארץ *'ereṣ* and → מדבר *miḏbār*. If one refuses to be content with positing a general synonymy, then *tēḇēl* is best explained as the "circle of the earth" floating in the primordial ocean. With its distant, uninhabited, and elevated edges (cf. *'apsê-'āreṣ*, "the ends of the earth," an expression which nevertheless still implies habitation: Jer. 16:19; Ps. 22:28[Eng. 27]; etc.[19]), it extends far beyond the inhabited world[20] (cf. also the Egyptian myth of the serpent Apophis).

Surprisingly, although the term appears primarily in the context of creation theology, it does not occur in the Pentateuch. This may be because *tēḇēl* is associated primarily not with narrative but with poetic genres that refer to cosmological and mythological themes.

The term *tēḇēl* appears most often in the Psalms (15 times) and the late strands of the book of Isaiah (9 times). Next come Job (3), Jeremiah and Proverbs (2 each), and Nahum and Lamentations (once each). It occurs twice in DtrH and once in ChrH. Because of their peculiar nature, however, these occurrences should be counted with the Psalms.

2. *Syntagms.* We find *tēḇēl* in a variety of syntagms: *'ereṣ wᵉtēḇēl* (Ps. 90:2); *tēḇēl 'ereṣ* + suf. (Job 37:12; Prov. 8:31), the latter frequently (but probably erroneously[21])

---

12. → V, 373-79.

13. *ANH*³, 438; *WTM*, IV, 624.

14. Beyer, 721.

15. *DISO*, 323; *AP* 26.4,8; > *tbl* II.

16. R. A. Bowman, *AJSL* 58 (1941) 308, following N. Aimé-Giron, *Textes araméens d'Égypte* (Cairo, 1931), 33.

17. *DISO*, 288-89.

18. → מוט *mwṭ*.

19. → I, 361-62; *GesB*¹⁸, 89-90.

20. Keel, 42.

21. → חוג *ḥûg*, esp. → IV, 246-47.

translated as "(his) round world" or "the circle of (his) earth." Others include *'aprôṯ tēḇēl* (Prov. 8:26), *mōsᵉḏôṯ tēḇēl,* "foundations of the earth" (2 S. 22:16//Ps. 18:16[15]), *pᵉnê ṯēḇēl,* most likely "surface of the earth" (but cf. EÜ: "circle of the earth") (e.g., Job 37:12), and *qᵉṣēh ṯēḇēl,* "end(s) of the earth" (Ps. 19:5[4]). The expressions *tēḇēl ûmᵉlō'â,* "the earth and all that fills it" (Ps. 50:12; 89:12[11]), and *tēḇēl wᵉḵol-ṣe'ᵉṣā'eyhā,* "the earth and all that comes from it" (Isa. 34:1)[22] are formulaic.

We find *tēḇēl* as the subject of the following verbs: *'ml* pual, "wilt"; *nāḇal,* "disintegrate"; *šāma',* "hear" (Isa. 34:1); *nāśā' (qôl),* "scream" (Nah. 1:5); *kwn* niphal, "be firmly established" (Ps. 93:1; 96:10); *rā'am,* "roar" (Ps. 98:7); *mûṭ,* "(not) totter" (1 Ch. 16:30); and *ḥyl* polel, "suffer birth pangs" (Ps. 90:2).

Almost all the verbs with *tēḇēl* as object have God or Yahweh as subject: *šîṯ* (1 S. 2:8), *kwn* hiphil (Jer. 10:12; 51:15), and *yāsaḏ* (Ps. 89:12), "establish"; *śîm,* "make (into a desert)" (Isa. 14:17); and *šāpaṭ,* "judge" (Ps. 9:9[8]; 96:13; etc.). In Ps. 77:19(18) God's lightnings light up the world; in Isa. 14:21 the successor of the king of Babylon will never again fill *(mālē')* the world with cities.

This survey leaves the impression that the translation "dry (or) habitable land" is too narrow: *tēḇēl* refers to the solid earth of ancient Near Eastern cosmology, whether bipartite (heaven and earth), tripartite (heaven, earth, sea), or even quadripartite (heaven, earth, waters above, waters below [including the netherworld]), often depicted visually, especially in Egypt.[23]

III. Theological Foci. Almost without exception, *tēḇēl* is found in late OT lyric poetry, in the context of early Jewish universalism. This poetry draws on the cosmology of the ancient Near East, which envisioned a solid disk-like earth floating on the water under the dome of heaven, which holds back the "waters above." Above all stood the throne of God, beneath lay the netherworld, the realm of the dead. Initially, Israel had no term to denote all this (cf. later → עולם *'ôlām*) except "heaven and earth" *(šāmayim wā'āreṣ).* The basic meaning of *tēḇēl* makes it ideally suited to denote the floating earth, but it comes to suggest the inhabited earth and elsewhere the cosmos, the universe (Isa. 44:24; Jer. 10:16; Eccl. 3:11; Ps. 98:7; 103:19).

1. *Creation.* Just as the ancient Near East thought of the world as the creation of the gods, so in the OT God is the creator of all that is, including the *tēḇēl.* But as creator he is also owner: "To Yahweh belong the pillars of the earth, on them he has set the circle of the earth," declares the Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:8; the image of the earth resting on pillars appears also in Ps. 75:4[3]; Job 9:6[24]). But Yahweh can turn this world on its head, creating a new situation for the poor among his people. It is interesting that the Song of Hannah approaches the theme of social justice from the perspective of creation

---

22. D. Kellermann, → XII, 208-10.
23. Keel, 15-56, esp. 56.
24. See ibid., 31-33, 39-40, 47.

the course of the lightning, which accomplishes his commands throughout the habitable world (37:12-13).

2. *Theophany.* God's creative power is a favorite motif in many OT theophanies. Nah. 1:5 (probably preexilic) presents the classic list of meteorological and seismological phenomena associated with theophanies in the OT. Yahweh approaches to execute judgment upon Nineveh; at his approach the whole universe cries aloud. In Ps. 18 the persecuted psalmist describes his deliverance under the aspect of a general theophanic intervention on the part of God. Just as Yahweh's intervention vanquishes the forces of chaos and lays them bare down to the very foundations of the world (v. 16[15]; cf. 2 S. 22:16),[32] so he vanquishes the enemies of the psalmist (vv. 16-20[15-19]).

Ps. 33:6-12 extols Yahweh as the mighty ruler of the universe, who has chosen Israel as his heritage through his acts in creation (vv. 6-9) and history (vv. 10-12). "All living creatures upon the earth are to recognize this mighty creator and preserver of the cosmos and live according to his design in creation and history."[33] Yahweh — under the guise of a storm god — makes the earth tremble (77:19[18]; 97:4). Such theophanic features play a pedagogical function in that they are intended to lead to knowledge: God is sovereign and dependent on no one (50:12); God's power over the waters shows that he is a God without equal (77:14,19[13,18]; cf. the motif of dividing the waters at the exodus in vv. 20-21[19-20]). Yahweh is king, and the cosmos proclaims his righteousness (97:1-6; 1 Ch. 16:30); he is incomparable and exalted far above all gods (Ps. 97:9); he will cause Israel to flourish once more, with wonderful consequences for the whole world (Isa. 27:6). At the end he will judge the peoples and nations, and the whole world will be witness when he proclaims his verdict (Isa. 34:1).

3. *Judgment.* In Lam. 4:12 the judgment on Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. takes on cosmic dimensions. Jerusalem was considered impregnable; no one in the whole world could have thought such a catastrophe possible. The theme of cosmic judgment is frequent in the book of Isaiah. God's creative might embodies the power to carry out his judgment. This is especially clear in the Isaiah apocalypse: the inhabited world *('ereṣ)* is laid waste and despoiled, so that it dries up and withers; the solid earth *(tēḇēl)* also languishes, heaven and earth *(hammārôm 'im hā'āreṣ)* perish (Isa. 24:3-4). The synonymous parallelisms in this paronomastically structured poem address the whole universe. The predicted cosmic catastrophe is due to the pollution of the earth through disobedience to the *tôrâ* (v. 5). It is not the consequence of mythological battles but is brought about solely and entirely by Yahweh (v. 1).

Just as Yahweh creates the world and endows it with fertility, so he can put an end to fertility throughout the world (Isa. 26:18). But the same late redactor is also convinced that God's judgment is a light to the world and reveals God's righteousness to the in-

32. On the structure of the theophany account and its late preexilic setting, see Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I,* 118-22.

33. Ibid., 209.

The emphasis on creation, especially in the theology of the Qumran Essene community, is clear in the texts governing the life of the community: God created the earth and the universe (*tbl,* 11QPs[a] 26:14) and has given humankind dominion over it (1QH 1:15; possibly also 4Q34bis 3 2:3). The human race was created to rule the world, under the influence of two spirits (1QS 3:18). The good spirit is to enlighten the hearts of people along their path *btbl* (4:2). The devout worshiper praises his God before eating his fill of the fruit of the earth (10:15).

At the end of time the "truth of the world" *(ʾmt tbl)* will be made plain (1QS 4:19) like the sun, the "measure of the world" (1Q27 1 1:7), and knowledge will pervade the universe. At the end of time, finally, those who scorn God's word will be eradicated from the world (*mtbl,* 1QS 5:19; 4Q258 1 1:11), while the members of the community will be like fire for the whole world (*kʾš lkwl tbl,* 4Q177 6 7 = 4QMidrEschat[ab] 10:7).[40]

These texts, primarily from the Manual of Discipline, show clearly that *tbl* was understood in a quite indefinite sense; it may even have come to serve as a term for the entire universe.

A blessing is pronounced on a devout member of the community, who will be a luminary enlightening the world with knowledge (*bdʿt,* 1QSb 4:17; cf. 1QM 8). The Damascus Document may use the word in a more specific sense: God has chosen the members of the community as "those who have fled the land *(ʾrṣ)*" in order to fill the world *(tbl)* with their seed (CD 2:12). Here the sons of truth must prove themselves (1QS 4:6; 4Q502 16 4). Here is heard the universal praise of Zion (4QPs[f] 8:9; 11QPs[a] 22:12). But *tbl* is also the realm of the enemy (CD 20:34), who are ultimately threatened with total annihilation (1QH 3:36), for the *tbl* is the place of calamity (1QH 3:33). The messiah (?) will one day cover the whole world with his shade (1QH 6:15; 4Q428 5 3). Possibly 4Q181(Ages of Creation) 1 3 envisions the conversion of some "children of the world" *(mbny tbl).* In the Apocryphon of Joseph, *tbl* occurs 3 times (4Q372 1 11,18,22): Joseph was thrown into foreign lands and scattered throughout the whole world.

The fragmentary nature of many texts makes their meaning unclear (1QSb 3:19; 1QH 6:17; 1QH fr. 18 6; fr. 28 2; 4Q169 1 9; 4Q219 5:14; 4Q298 1 2:5; 4Q369 1 2:7; 4Q379 13 2; 30 2; 4Q418 [4 times]; 4Q426 1 1:9; 4Q433 1 5; 4Q443 6 2; 4Q461 1 7; 4Q496 76 2; 4Q499 48 2).

V. *teḇel.* The noun *teḇel* occurs only twice in the OT; it clearly denotes a "perversion": intercourse of a woman with an animal (Lev. 18:23//20:16, without *teḇel*) or intercourse of a man with his daughter-in-law (20:12).[41] The etymology of the word is unclear. A derivation within Hebrew from the vb. *bll,*[42] "mix, confuse," is likely. In Middle Hebrew we find the nouns *toḇlāʾ/tiḇlāʾ,* "perversion," with reference to 20:12,

40. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumran-Gemeinde. STDJ* 13 (1994), 73, 78.

41. *HAL,* II, 1683.

42. → I, 466.

and *taḇlûl*, "confusion."[43] There is no clear instance of the word in the Dead Sea Scrolls, except possibly 4Q219 5:14, "confusion and no truth" *(tbl w'yn 'mt)*.

The 2 occurrences in Lev. 17–26 associate *teḇel* explicitly with the sins against the will of Yahweh that are referred to elsewhere as *tô'ēḇâ*, "abomination."[44] Preuss observes correctly that 18:22-23 and 20:12-13 are exceptions to this general conceptuality, referring to sexual sins that clearly offend against sacral law, which according to 20:11-17 are even punishable by death.[45] These actions are offenses against the natural order.[46]

It may be our modern sense of right and wrong that (inappropriately) sees in *teḇel* a more serious offense than in *tô'ēbâ*. Clearly these laws reflect an effort to maintain the purity and holiness of the community, which must display itself particularly in the protection of the marital relationship.[47] If we follow Elliger[48] in seeing the condemnation of bestiality — sexual relations between a woman and an animal (18:23; cf. 20:15 for male bestiality) — as a defense against pagan and superstitious animal cults,[49] then the offenses labeled *teḇel* are ultimately religious offenses,[50] punishable under sacral law. There is possibly some thought of Baal, who had intercourse with Anat in the form of a young cow.

Neither in Canaan nor in Mesopotamia is bestiality explicitly forbidden. Such prohibitions are found only in Hittite and Israelite law.[51]

The LXX uses two different translations: *myserós* in Lev. 18:23 and *asebeín* in 20:12.

Fabry/van Meeteren

---

43. *ANH*³, 438; *WTM*, IV, 624.

44. → תועבה, III.4.

45. H. D. Preuss, *OT Theology*. *OTL*, 2 vols. (Eng. tr. 1995-96), II, 188-93.

46. G. J. Wenham, *Leviticus*. *NICOT* (1979), 260.

47. K. Elliger, *Leviticus*. *HAT* I/4 (1966), 274-77.

48. Ibid., 241.

49. W. Krebs, *FuF* 37 (1963) 19-21.

50. W. Kornfeld, *Levitikus*. *NEB* (1983), 71-72.

51. H. A. Hoffner Jr., "Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East," in Hoffner, ed., *Orient and Occident*. *FS C. H. Gordon*. *AOAT* 22 (1973), 81-90.

תֹּהוּ *tōhû*

I. Etymology: 1. Early Theories; 2. Ugaritic; 3. Egyptian. II. Distribution and Semantics: 1. Trackless Waste; 2. Desolation; 3. Lifelessness; 4. Futility; 5. Worthlessness. III. *tōhû wāḇōhû:* 1. Cosmology; 2. Gen. 1:2; 3. Religio-historical Background. IV. Greek Versions. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology.

1. *Early Theories.* Eighteenth-century lexicographers derived *tōhû* from a hypothetical base *thh,* e.g., the lexicon published by Buxtorf in 1735, where it is translated "Inanitas, Inane, Res informis";[1] cf. also Gusset's lexicon of 1743.[2] In Maius's 1714 revision of the lexicon of Cocceius, it is translated "carens ordine et ornatu; ungeziert, eitel, öde"; the later (1777) revision of the same lexicon by Schulz connects it with Arab. *taha'.*[3] According to Simonis (1756), the word means "vastitas, inanitas," and derives from Aram. *tahah,* "vastus, inanis fuit."[4] Gesenius grants the abnormality of

---

tōhû. G. Anderson, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums," *CBQ* 52 (1990) 21-29, esp. 23; W. Barta, "Die Bedeutung der Personifikation Huh im Unterschied zu den Personifikationen Hah und Nun," *GMA* 127 (1992) 7-12; M. Bauks and G. Baumann, "Im Anfang war . . . ?" *BN* 71 (1994) 24-52; D. Börner-Klein, "*Tohu* und *Bohu,*" *Hen* 15 (1993) 3-41; J. Ebach, *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos. BWANT* 108 (1979); K. Galling, "Der Charakter der Chaosschilderung in Gen. 1,2," *ZTK* 47 (1950) 145-57; M. Görg, "Chaos," *NBL,* I, 363-64; idem, " 'Chaos' and 'Chaosmächte' im AT," *BN* 70 (1993) 48-61; idem, "Komplementäres zur etymologischen Deutung von *thwm,*" *BN* 67 (1993) 5-7; idem, "Ptolemäische Theologie in der Septuaginta," *Kairos* 20 (1978) 208-17 = *Studien zur biblisch-ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte. SBAB* 14 (1992), 225-38; idem, "*Tohû wabohû* — ein Deutungsvorschlag," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 431-34; idem, "Vom Wehen der Pneuma," *BN* 66 (1993) 5-9; idem, "Zur Ikonographie des Chaos," *BN* 14 (1981) 18-19; idem, "Zur Struktur von Gen 1,2," *BN* 62 (1992) 11-15; O. Keel, "Altägyptische und biblische Weltbilder, die Anfänge der vorsokratischen Philosophie und das Ἀρχή-Problem in späten biblischen Schriften," in M. Svilar and S. Kunze, eds., *Weltbilder* (Bern, 1993), 127-56; R. Kilian, "Gen. I 2 und die Urgötter von Hermopolis," *VT* 16 (1966) 420-38; W. G. Lambert, "A Further Note on *tōhû wābōhû,*" *UF* 20 (1988) 135; V. Notter, *Biblischer Schöpfungsbericht und ägyptische Schöpfungsmythen. SBS* 68 (1974), esp. 15-35; T. Podella, "Der 'Chaoskampfmythos' im AT," in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, eds., *Mesopotamica — Ugaritica — Biblica. FS K. Bergerhof. AOAT* 232 (1993), 283-329; N. H. Ridderbos, "Genesis i 1 und 2," *OTS* 12 (1958) 214-60, esp. 224-27; B. Schaller, "Gen 1:2 im spätantiken Judentum" (diss., Göttingen, 1961); K. Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 1929, no. 4 (1929); E. F. Sutcliffe, "Primeval Chaos not Scriptural," *Miscellanea Biblica,* II (Rome, 1934), 203-15; D. T. Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2. JSOTSup* 83 (1989); idem, "*Nabalkutu, Tu-a-bi-*[*ú*] and *Tōhû wābōhû,*" *UF* 19 (1987) 309-15; N. Wyatt, "The Darkness of Genesis I 2," *VT* 43 (1993) 543-54.

1. P. 856.
2. P. 1707.
3. P. 1592.
4. P. 1063.

thh, but cites similar roots in Aramaic and Arabic and proposes a connection with *šā'â.*[5] Since then, *tōhû* has been interpreted as a segholate form (analogous to *qōdeš* < *qudš*) and assigned the meanings "vastitas, inanitas, vanitas" ("desolation" and "emptiness, vanity"). The derivation of *tōhû* from **tuhw* is particularly emphasized by König,[6] who also cites Arab. *tîhum,* "desertum," and *tâha,* "attonitus erravit."

According to Meier, the root *tahah* has the meaning "make dense, make firm, draw together"; the primary meaning of *tōhû* is "that which is drawn together; dense heap; rough, chaotic mass; jumble."[7] This meaning develops into "devastation, destruction, and desolation," figuratively "desolation = emptiness, nothingness." He takes Aram. *taha* to be a denominative. Maurer (1851) also posits a root *thh,* but assigns it the basic meaning "be knocked down, trampled underfoot."[8] Fürst (1861) takes a similar position, associating *thh* etymologically with Heb. *šā'â* and semantically with the base *šāwâ.*[9]

To this day no one has been able to identify a Hebrew base. More recently, therefore, *tōhû* has been called a primary noun.[10] At the same time there is continued support for a development *tuhw* > *tōhû.*[11] If this theory is correct, Middle Heb. *tāhâ,* Arab./Aram. *tuh,*[12] and Arab. *tīh,* "desert,"[13] are all secondary derivatives.

2. *Ugaritic.* Ugaritic has a noun *thw,* which Tsumura (following Dussaud, Gordon, Caquot, et al.) considers to be related to Heb. *tōhû* and translates as "desert."[14] In one text the noun phrase *npš lbym thw* parallels *brlt 'nḫr bym,* so that *thw* may be taken as corresponding to *bym.*[15] A parallel text[16] contains the variant *lbym thwt.*[17] Albright, Gaster, Greenstein, et al., however, associate the Ugaritic word with Arab. *hawiya,* "desire." Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín derive *thw* and *thwt* from a base **hwy* (cf. Heb. **'wh*). The existence of an Ugaritic word *thw* meaning "desert" is defended by del Olmo Lete.[18] An article by Dietrich and Loretz[19] indicates that the only form needing explanation is *thw* and that "the parallelism *thw//ym*" in the first text demonstrates that "*thw* is a noun, and is not to be analyzed as a finite verb form of **hwy.*" It is still probably impossible to reach an unequivocal decision.[20] If there is an Ugaritic noun *thw* meaning "desert" or the like, there is support for an indirect visual connotation.

---

5. *GesTh,* 1494.
6. König, 535.
7. E. Meier, *Hebräisches Wurzelwörterbuch* (Mannheim, 1845), 441.
8. P. 949.
9. P. 515.
10. *HAL,* II, 1689.
11. E.g., W. Richter, *Biblia hebraica transcripta I: Genesis. ATS* 33/1 (1991), 16.
12. *GesB,* 871.
13. *HAL,* II, 1689.
14. Tsumura, *UF* 19:307-8; idem, *Earth,* 18-19.
15. *KTU* 1.5, I, 14-16.
16. *KTU* 1.133, 3-4.
17. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *UF* 7 (1975) 536-37.
18. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 635.
19. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 23 (1991) 95.
20. *HAL,* II, 1689.

Most scholars do not posit an etymological connection — over and above simple alliteration — between *tōhû* and the noun → תהום *t*ᵉ*hôm*.[39] Despite the majority view that *tōhû* is a West Semitic primary noun,[40] one cannot rule out the possibility of a connection with the Egyptian base *thm*[41] or an etymological relationship with the base *thy/ȝ*. Egyp. *thm* can be a complementary form of *thy/ȝ*. In an inscription of Pharaoh Merneptah,[42] the two verbs even appear together as terms for military actions conducted by Egypt's enemies and therefore are closely related semantically.

II. Distribution and Semantics. The noun *tōhû* occurs 40 times, 11 in the book of Isaiah alone. In Isa. 29:13 emendation of *watt*ᵉ*hî* to *w*ᵉ*ṯōhû* has been proposed on the basis of the LXX (cf. also Mk. 7:7), but this emendation is not strictly necessary.[43] Four texts use the definite article with *tōhû* (1 S. 12:21; Isa. 29:21; 40:23; Job 6:18). Besides these occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, the noun appears also in Sir. 41:10.[44]

1. *Trackless Waste.* In Dt. 32:10 the prepositional compound *b*ᵉ*ṯōhû* stands in climactic parallelism with *b*ᵉ*'ereṣ miḏbār,* describing the place of Jacob's election. It is insufficient simply to suggest a geographical orientation recalling Israel's period in the wilderness; the words *y*ᵉ*lēl y*ᵉ*šimōn,* "where wild beasts howl," amplifying *b*ᵉ*ṯōhû,* show clearly that the text is meant to describe an environment of mortal peril. According to the evidence of Palestinian iconography, the mention of wild beasts signals the sphere of menace.[45]

Job 12:24 and Ps. 107:40 employ an identical image in the same way: "(God) made them wander in a trackless waste." Clearly these words refer not to literal exile in a wasteland but to the disoriented bewilderment of those stripped of understanding by God. The prepositional compound appears with the article in Job 6:18, where a caravan that turns aside from its course (v. 18a) is described as wandering *battōhû* — again, the text does not refer to the wilderness simply as a geological phenomenon; this straying leads to death.

2. *Desolation.* A further dimension appears when *tōhû* is used as the *nomen rectum* in a construct phrase. In Isa. 24:10 and 34:11, the two "apocalypses" of the book of Isaiah speak of a coming desolation, also illustrated by the image of a hostile wasteland. According to 24:10, the "*tōhû* city," probably Jerusalem, will be a place of desolation, representing the state to which the "earth" has descended when Yahweh has twisted its

---

39. Wyatt, 549 n. 9.

40. E.g., *HAL,* II, 1689.

41. Görg, *BN* 66; idem, *BN* 67.

42. E. Edel, *ZÄS* 86 (1961) 101-3.

43. E.g., H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 87; *HAL,* II, 1690.

44. For surveys of the noun's distribution see C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 102-3; Tsumura, *Earth,* 30-31; L. Ruppert, *Genesis. FzB* 70 (1992), 66.

45. Illustration in O. Keel et al., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina-Israel 3: Die frühe Eisenzeit. OBO* 100 (1990), 30-31.

surface and scattered its inhabitants (v. 1; cf. also vv. 3-6). The noun *tōhû* sums up the details of the disaster described in the following context (vv. 11-12) — total estrangement from life. The term semantically closest to *tōhû* is probably *šammâ* in v. 12a (cf. also Jer. 4:27).

In a similar vein Isa. 34:11 uses the image of beasts in the wilderness to describe baleful desolation; the phrase "line of *tōhû*" describes the desolate existence that Yahweh will impose on the land of Edom (cf. also v. 17). The discrepancy is all the clearer when we contrast this image with the function of the divine measuring line in the vision of Zec. 2:5-9(Eng. 1-5), where it symbolizes Yahweh's all-embracing plan (cf. also Isa. 40:12).[46]

3. *Lifelessness.* Another perspective appears when the noun is used with verbs that illustrate the process of cosmogony. According to Isa. 45:18, Yahweh did not "create" the earth a *tōhû* but "formed" it to be inhabitable. The synonymous parallelism of *br'* and *yṣr* contrasts with the antithetical parallelism of *tōhû* vs. *laššeḇeṯ,* which once again characterizes *tōhû* as a state in which it is impossible to dwell[47] secure, i.e., a state unfit for human beings. The context confirms this perspective: the command to Jacob, "Do not seek me in *tōhû*" (v. 19), means that God is not present in the realm of all that is hidden, enigmatic, alien to human life — note the parallelism with "land of darkness."[48]

Job 26:7 is obviously based on the image of spreading out *(nṭh)* the fabric of a tent; participial phrases describe Yahweh as spreading out Zaphon over *tōhû (nōṭeh ṣāp̄ôn ʿal-tōhû)* and hanging the earth upon "nothing" *(bᵉlî-mâ).* Here "Zaphon" ("the north") denotes the mountain of God, which both instantiates the heavenly manifestation of God and provides shelter for everything that lives. Synonymous parallelism links Zaphon and the earth, *tōhû* and "nothing," so that *tōhû* represents the realm of negativity, from which the realm of life is set apart by Yahweh's sovereign act.

A similar act of divine sovereignty, both creative and salvific, is described in Isa. 40:22-23, where Yahweh stretches out the heavens as a protection for earthly life (v. 22b) and makes the rulers of the earth "as *tōhû*" (v. 23). Thus the arrogant are consigned to the sphere of all that is alien to life. The nations, too, are "as *tōhû*," i.e., consigned to the realm of lifelessness, on account of the incomparability of the God of Israel (Isa. 40:7).

4. *Futility.* These images of *tōhû* bring us to a usage where the noun is almost equivalent to "futility," describing particularly the works of human hands that are dedicated to idolatry. Deutero-Isaiah's polemic against idolatry plays a central role here: *tōhû* serves to characterize those objects opposed to the obligation to serve the one and only God. Idols can be called *rûaḥ wāṯōhû* (Isa. 41:29): in coordination with "wind" *tōhû*

46. See also III.1 below.

47. → ישׁב *yāšaḇ.*

48. Tsumura, *Earth,* 35-36.

1. *Cosmology.* This idea takes on cosmic dimensions in the vision in Jer. 4:23: "I see the earth: behold — *tōhû wāḇōhû*." This statement parallels a vision of the heavens devoid of lights. Thus for the word pair *tōhû wāḇōhû* we can claim the negative elements that are central to *tōhû* by itself, the perilous, menacing phenomena of tracklessness and instability. Since the word *bōhû* never occurs independently but appears only in these three passages, always in association with and preceded by *tōhû*, its semantic contribution can only be to complement the state denoted by *tōhû*.

Attempts to find an etymology for *bōhû* among other Near Eastern languages have so far proved unsuccessful.[52] Neither the name of the Sumerian deity Bau nor the figure of Baau mentioned by Philo of Byblos is semantically or etymologically relevant.[53] Analogously to *tōhû*, however, it is possible to posit a relationship with the Egyp. vb. *bhꜣ*, which is used almost exclusively to describe the "flight" of Egypt's enemies and may be considered their "typical behavior."[54] The panic-stricken flight of the enemy[55] is the counterpart to the aggressive but ultimately futile agitation against the legitimate ruler, who as preserver of order (Egyp. *maʿat*) goes against the enemy, the personification of "disorder." Characteristically, the so-called Hittite treaty of Ramses II, intended as a "treaty establishing order" par excellence, describes both enemies and fugitives as the embodiment of the disordered world, thus making them the subject of a special contractual agreement.

It is therefore still legitimate to assume that the word pair *tōhû wāḇōhû* is grounded semantically in the characteristic of menacing reality that can be represented by the term "chaos,"[56] albeit with reservations.[57] In Jer. 4:23 we may note a cosmic orientation of the expression, which envisions a "chaotic" state of the "earth" like the primordial state described in Gen. 1:2. Although the two occurrences and their contexts are literarily independent, common allusions are recognizable. Fishbane[58] posits a "recovered use of the creation pattern" in Jeremiah, whereas Tsumura[59] imputes to the two texts "a common literary tradition in their use of *tōhû wābōhû*."

2. *Gen. 1:2.* Most scholars still maintain that Gen. 1:1 is an independent main clause.[60] If this is not the case, the three nominal clauses making up v. 2 must be explained syntactically either as a chain of clauses continuing the main clause beginning with *bᵉrē'šîṯ* in v. 1 as a pendent element,[61] or else (probably better) interpret them as

52. See I.2 above.

53. Görg, *ZAW* 92.

54. E. Blumenthal, *Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum der Mittleren Reiches I: Phraseologie. ASAW* 61/1 (1970), 215.

55. E.g., *Urk.* IV, 711, 1.

56. Westermann and others, contra Tsumura.

57. Görg, *BN* 70.

58. M. Fishbane, *VT* 21 (1971) 151-67.

59. *Earth,* 37-40.

60. E.g., E. Jenni, *ZAH* 2 (1989) 121-27.

61. W. Gross, "Syntaktische Erscheinungen am Anfang althebräischer Erzählungen," *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 142-45; idem, *Die Pendenskonstruktion im biblischen Hebräisch. ATS* 27 (1987), 52-53.

modifying an attributive clause beginning with *br'*, so that the main clause does not reappear until v. 3.[62] The problematic syntax, which makes the assignment of v. 2 a dilemma, is best accounted for on the basis of redaction history, by treating v. 2 as the beginning of an initial recension of P's creation account, which was later set in the interpretive framework of vv. 1 and 3. The special position of v. 2 may also be accentuated by the criteria of poetic language.[63]

The first nominal clause in v. 2, which contains our word pair, thus characterizes the status[64] of the earth, its condition prior to the event of creation. If we take into account the semantic dimension of *tōhû* and *bōhû,* we see that the earth is described not simply as "an unproductive and uninhabited place,"[65] but as a hostile and uninhabitable environment that is transformed into a welcoming environment and given a future-oriented perspective only by the sovereign intervention of God the creator.[66] Considerations of both form and content prevent interpreting *tōhû wāḇōhû* along the lines of the "when . . . not yet" formulas found elsewhere in the Bible and in the ancient Near East, if the word pair is to be "less a qualitative description than a negative particle."[67] The words do not convey a simple "not yet"[68] but an ominous potential. At the outset the "earth" is a hostile environment, but it becomes welcoming.

3. *Religio-Historical Background.* Kilian was the first to interpret the word pair *tōhû wāḇōhû* against the background of Sethe's study of Amon and the primeval gods of Hermopolis. He identified *tōhû wāḇōhû* as the counterpart to a phenomenon associated with the primeval god Nun, more specifically the deities Heh and Heket, who embodied "infinity, boundlessness, the formlessness of the primal deep" or the mutually interchangeable deities Niau, Gereh, and Tenemu as manifestations of the "passivity and inactivity" of Nun. Notter preferred to associate *tōhû wāḇōhû* with Niau. Subsequent discussion has led to a proposed identification of *thw* as equivalent to Heh/Hehet ("boundless desolation") and *bhw* as equivalent to Niau/Niaut ("nothingness").[69] More recently, Keel has associated *tōhû wāḇōhû* with the primeval god Heh or the Hehu gods of "infinity," without insisting on the "fundamental character" of Nun.

Barta has pointed out the phonetic and functional distinction between Hah, the primeval god of "infinity," and Huh, the "surging, swelling primal deep." Therefore the analogy to the four pairs of primal deities at Hermopolis can be limited to the entities mentioned in the two following noun clauses in Gen. 1:2,[70] so that *tōhû wāḇōhû* can still best be understood as characterizing a primordial state of "chaos."[71] The word pair

---

62. Richter, *Genesis,* 16.
63. Wyatt.
64. Assmann's term.
65. Tsumura, *Earth,* 43.
66. M. Görg, → XIII, 648-49.
67. Bauks and Baumann, 36.
68. Tsumura, *Earth,* 43.
69. Görg, *Kairos* 20.
70. Görg, *BN* 62.
71. Contra Sutcliffe, Tsumura, and others.

the eyes of God, using *thw* and *hbl* in parallel (1QH 7:32; cf. Isa. 49:4). A similar expression of human lowliness appears in 1QH fr. 11:7: *lpnk* [ ]*thw wyṣr ḥ*[*mr*](?). Similarly, in the eyes of God all nations are *thw* and *ʾps* (4Q504 1-2 3:3). Finally, the War Scroll uses the same idea to describe the godless as inclining toward *thw* and *bhw* (1QM 17:4); unlike faithful Israel, they have no secure foundation.[75]

Görg

75. On the interpretation of this expression in later Judaism see Börner-Klein, 8-9.

תְּהוֹם *tᵉhôm*

I. Etymology and Milieu: 1. Etymology; 2. Religio-historical Background. II. Meaning and Occurrences: 1. Meaning; 2. Occurrences; 3. Lexical Field. III. Contexts: 1. Creation; 2. Chaos and the Exodus; 3. Cosmology. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Milieu.

1. *Etymology.* The Hebrew noun *tᵉhôm* probably derives from a Common Semitic term **tihām(at)*, with the basic meaning "sea." Although the Akkadian noun *tiamtu(m)* (later *tâmtu*[*m*]) is the normal word for "sea,"[1] corresponding to West Sem. *ym* and Arab. *baḥr*,[2] Heb. *tᵉhôm* is not an Akkadian loanword. Because the OT uses *tᵉhôm* as a

tᵉhôm. O. Eissfeldt, "Das Chaos in der biblischen und in der phönizischen Kosmogonie," *KlSchr,* II (1963), 258-62; idem, "Gott und das Meer in der Bibel," *KlSchr,* III (1966), 256-64; M. Görg, "Komplementäres zur etymologischen Deutung von *thwm,*" *BN* 67 (1993) 5-7; idem, "Zur Struktur von Gen 1,2," *BN* 62 (1992) 11-15; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (1895; Eng. tr. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton* [Grand Rapids, 2006]); A. Heidel, *Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, ²1951); R. Hillmann, "Wasser und Berg" (diss., Halle/Saale, 1965); O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 78 (²1962); R. Kilian, "Gen I 2 und die Urgötter von Hermopolis," *VT* 16 (1966) 420-38; H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *MAYIM RABBÎM,* 'Many Waters,'" *JBL* 74 (1955) 9-21; S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer. CBOT* 9 (1977); P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie, et sa signification dans l'AT. SVT* 6 (1958); W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 (1966); idem, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 115 (²1981); N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969); D. T. Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2. JSOTSup* 83 (1989).

1. *AHw,* III, 1353-54.
2. → VI, 87.

proper name without the article (except in Isa. 63:13 and Ps. 106:9),[3] it was widely thought in the past that *tᵉhôm* might derive from the Babylonian sea god Tiamat. This theory, however, is no longer tenable, not least because there is no evidence for a shift of Akk. ʾ to Heb. *h*;[4] we would expect such a loanword to have a form like **tiʾāmā*.[5] There is also no etymological support for a derivation from the verbal root *hûm*, "roar,"[6] or an association with the Egyptian root *thm*, which has a verbal meaning extending "from 'push' through 'press' to 'shoot'" and also appears as a noun meaning "puncture wound"(?).[7]

Therefore *tᵉhôm* is probably a primary noun.[8] It appears in the Ebla texts in the forms *ti-ʾa-ma-tum* and *ti-ʾà-ma-tum/tiham-at-um*. Closest to *tᵉhôm* is Ugar. *thm*, "sea, the deep."[9] Apart from the dual *thmtm*, we find the corresponding sg. *thm* (without a fem. ending) and the pl. *thmt*. Analogously to the lexical field of *tᵉhôm*,[10] the nouns *ʾrṣ, ym, mdbr, nhr,* and *šmm* appear in parallel with *thm*. Jewish Aram. and Syr. *tᵉhômāʾ* should be considered Hebrew loanwords. The noun is also attested in Samaritan, Imperial Aramaic, and Middle Hebrew.[11] Arab. *tihāmah* is found only as a geographical term for the coastal plain along the southwestern and southern shores of Arabia.[12]

2. *Religio-historical Background.* Even though Heb. *tᵉhôm* cannot derive from the Babylonian deity Tiamat, and the common Semitic root **tihām(at)* originally denoted the sea as an unpersonified entity, the significance of the primeval waters in the creation accounts of the ancient Near East indicates a mythological dimension. Behind all the various cosmogonies stands the shared notion that the world was created from water and that the earth from its first beginnings was surrounded on all sides by water.

a. *Egypt.* In Egypt everything arises from Nun, the primal ocean, which surrounds the ordered world. From it the sun comes forth afresh each morning. It is associated with the notion of fertility, for the Nile is fed by its waters. This realm of Nun, to which neither gods nor spirits have access, is thought of "as an accumulation of primal matter, without light or form,"[13] reflecting the sinister nature of primordial chaos. In the cosmogony of Hermopolis, Nun belongs to the four pairs of primal deities that personify the state of the world before creation: Nun and Naunet, representing the primal ocean; Huh and Hauhet, endlessness; Kuk and Kauket, darkness; and Amon and Amaunet, wind. Being concrete, Nun and Naunet represent primal matter; the other three pairs, abstract in meaning, are to be understood as attributes of Nun.

---

3. Meyer, III, §96.2a.
4. Tsumura, 46.
5. Heidel, 100.
6. *GesB,* 159, 796.
7. Görg, *BN* 67:6-7.
8. *HAL,* II, 1690.
9. *UT,* no. 2537.
10. See II.2 below.
11. *HAL,* II, 1690-91.
12. Wehr, 98.
13. Kaiser, 28.

Kilian finds here clear equivalents to the elements in Gen. 1:2 that characterize the state of the world before creation. He identifies *tᵉhôm* with Nun, *ḥōšeḵ* with Kuk, *rûaḥ ᵓᵉlōhîm* with Amon, and *tōhû wāḇōhû* with Huh. Huh is understood as expressing the "passivity and inactivity" of Nun, echoed in Gen. 1:2 by *tōhû wāḇōhû* with the meaning "inactive and impassive."[14] Görg has rightly raised objections to this interpretation, since the syntactic structure of Gen. 1:2 requires associating *tᵉhôm, ḥōšeḵ, rûaḥ ᵓᵉlōhîm,* and *hammayim* with the Ogdoad of Hermopolis. He therefore identifies *hammayim* with Huh; Huh does not personify endlessness,[15] but may be understood as "flowing waters" in contrast to Nun, who represents "still waters."[16]

b. *Mesopotamia.* In Sumerian cosmogony all that was present before the creation of the world was the primal ocean Nammu, also called *abzu,* from which heaven and earth emerged. This notion also dominates Babylonian cosmogony; describing the primordial state of the world, a didactic poem on creation says: "All lands were sea."[17] According to Eusebius, Berossus (ca. 300 B.C.E.) still believed that "there was a time when the universe was darkness and water."[18]

Enuma Elish attests that the primal waters were not of uniform consistency. In the beginning there was Apsu, the progenitor, and Tiamat, the goddess of creation: "they had mingled their waters."[19] Apsu represented the freshwater sea, Tiamat the saltwater ocean. From them arose the gods. In a second phase of the theomachy that followed, Tiamat together with Kingu and her helpers who sowed confusion were therefore vanquished and slain in battle by Marduk. He split her body in two and made one half into the heavens, over which he placed guardians to safeguard its waters. He probably created the earth from the other half, but the text is no longer clear on this point.[20]

c. *Ugarit.* To date there is no evidence of a creation myth in the Ugaritic texts. Baal's battle with Yam is not equivalent to Marduk's battle with Tiamat, since the latter does not precede creation but rather appears to presuppose the existence of the world.[21] The course and end of the conflict seem rather to correspond to the first phase of the theomachy in Enuma Elish, which ends with Ea's victory over Apsu.[22] There may be a relationship between the cosmic waters *(thmtm)* and El, who bears the title "creator" *(bny bnwt).* He has his dwelling place "at the source of the two rivers, at the outlet of the two oceans" *(mbk nhrm qrb ᵓpq thmtm).*[23] The interpretation of this formulaic statement is disputed. All that seems certain is that the abode of El is here thought of as lying at a mythical distance, at the end of the world, "where the waters of the upper world

14. Kilian, 433-34.
15. Citing W. Barta, *GMA* 127 (1992) 7-12.
16. Görg, *BN* 62:15.
17. *AOT,* 130.
18. *AOT,* 137.
19. *TUAT,* III/4, 569.
20. Heidel, 116.
21. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes,* 46.
22. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. tr. 1984), 28-29.
23. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 21-22; cf. Tsumura, 54.

and those of the nether world come together."[24] But the inference that El, like Ea-Enki, was "the god of the depths"[25] is questionable.[26]

Gunkel was still able to assume that most of the OT ideas concerning creation, especially those in Gen. 1, could be traced to the Babylonian cosmogony of Enuma Elish. Besides similarities in the sequence of events, he took as evidence the tradition of battle with the monster and the primordial ocean. Later scholarship, however, has shown that only in the rarest cases can such dependencies be truly demonstrated. The traditio-historical background is much broader; as a rule it cannot be restricted to a single domain, whether Egypt or Mesopotamia.

II. Meaning and Occurrences.

1. *Meaning.* The religio-historical evidence makes it unlikely that in the OT *tᵉhôm* denotes primarily a "natural phenomenon."[27] Despite all the differences between the ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies and the ideas of the OT, *tᵉhôm* represents both the cosmic waters surrounding the earth and the primeval waters. Tromp has summarized its meaning quite accurately: "Hebrew *tᵉhôm* is a vigorous and often grim word, which never entirely renounced its mythical past. A primordial strength pervades *tᵉhôm* throughout. It stands for: *a*) the primeval ocean; *b*) the waters round the earth after creation, which continually threaten the cosmos; *c*) these waters as a source of blessing for the earth."[28]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *tᵉhôm* occurs 36 times in the OT, 22 times in the singular and 14 in the plural, without any noticeable difference in meaning. It is treated as both masculine and feminine. Almost without exception, these occurrences are in poetic texts, primarily in the Psalter (12 times). The language of the Psalms also appears in Ex. 15:5,8; Dt. 33:13; Isa. 51:10; 63:13; Jon. 2:6; and Hab. 3:10. In addition, the noun occurs 4 times each in Genesis, Job, and Proverbs; 3 times in Ezekiel; and in Dt. 8:7 and Am. 7:4.

3. *Lexical Field.* Only in *tᵉhôm rabbâ,* "great deep" (Gen. 7:11; Isa. 51:10; Am. 7:4; Ps. 36:7[Eng. 6]; cf. 78:15), do we appear to have a conventional expression, corresponding to *mayim rabbîm,* "great waters." In Ezk. 26:19 and 31:15 the latter is synonymous with *tᵉhôm.* Indeed, → מים *mayim* is the word most commonly associated with *tᵉhôm,* usually standing in parallel. Like the "waters of the sea" (*mê yām,* Ps. 33:7), the text may speak of the "waters of the deep" (*mê tᵉhôm,* Isa. 51:10). Generally speaking, the lexical field of *tᵉhôm* is characterized by nouns that describe the cosmos: *šāmayim,* "heavens"; *'ereṣ,* "earth"; *har,* "mountain"; *šᵉ'ôl,* "netherworld"; or that are associated with water: *yām,* "sea"; *nāhār,* "river"; *naḥal,* "wadi"; *'ayin* or *ma'yān,* "spring";

24. Schmidt, *Schöpfungsgeschichte,* 6.
25. Kaiser, 50.
26. Schmidt, *Schöpfungsgeschichte,* 7; → I, 244-53.
27. C. Westermann, *TLOT,* III, 1412.
28. P. 59.

nōzᵉlîm, "streams"; *mᵉṣûlâ* and *maʿᵃmaqqê-yām*, "depths of the sea"; *gal*, "waves"; *šaḥaq*, "clouds"; and *ṭal*, "dew." We also find *miḏbār*, "desert," in passages that allude to God's deliverance at the Sea of Reeds (*yam-sûp*, Isa. 63:13; Ps. 106:9). This context shows that *tᵉhôm* takes its true meaning from the cosmic dimensions of the primeval waters, even though this sense appears to be attenuated in many passages (e.g., Dt. 8:7).

III. Contexts.

1. *Creation.* The various meanings of *tᵉhôm* in the OT are still best explained through their place and function in the texts having to do with creation.[29] According to Ps. 104, in the beginning the *tᵉhôm* covered the earth "like a garment," and its waters stood "above the mountains" (v. 6). Only Yahweh's creative power ("at your rebuke they fled, at the sound of your thunder they were put to flight") put an end to this grim state (v. 7) by establishing regular watercourses (v. 8) and fixing an impassable boundary to restrain the waters (v. 9). "The deadly water chaos becomes a fountain of life,"[30] as vv. 10ff. vividly describe.

Gen. 1:2 is the passage most often discussed in connection with *tᵉhôm*.[31] Here *tᵉhôm* is among the elements that characterize the state of the world before creation, a state defined initially (v. 2aα) as *tōhû wāḇōhû*.[32] That P, like Ps. 104, is drawing on traditional ideas is indisputable. The analogous association of "darkness," "deep," "wind," and "water" in various ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies suggests the same conclusion.[33] Here *tᵉhôm* is the primeval deep covered with darkness *(ḥōšeḵ)* — not, however, a personified entity possessing its own creative potential (cf. *ʾereṣ* in vv. 13,24). For P the mythical dimension resides only in the use of *tᵉhôm* for the unrestrained, chaotic waters prior to creation, which then appear as *mayim* and, by virtue of God's command, are assigned their appropriate place in the world (vv. 6,9).

In the deluge, however, the waters of the *tᵉhôm* become active again. Their "fountains" *(maʿyᵉnōṯ)* burst forth and the "windows of the heavens" *(ʾᵃrubbōṯ haššāmayim)* are opened (Gen. 7:11), so that once more there is "an invasion of chaos into the created order."[34] When the deluge ends, the fountains and windows are shut (8:2). Unlike J, who describes the coming of the deluge in naturalistic terms as a rain *(gešem)* lasting 40 days and 40 nights (7:12), P sees cosmic dimensions in the deluge.

The need to restrain the primeval waters in the context of creation is also mentioned in Ps. 33:7 and Prov. 8:27-29. According to Prov. 8:22, wisdom was the first of God's works of creation. This statement is amplified in v. 24 by a clause saying that wisdom was brought forth "when there were as yet no depths" *(bᵉʾên-tᵉhōmôṯ)*. Even if this means that the *tᵉhōmôṯ* must be included in the created world, the primary purpose of

29. Contra Westermann, *TLOT*, III, 1412-14.
30. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 300.
31. Schmidt, *Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 78-80, 178-81; Steck, 223-39.
32. → תהו *tōhû*.
33. See I.2 above.
34. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 434.

the statement appears to be to bring out the temporal precedence of wisdom over the rest of creation. This precedence is lent particular weight by the reference to the "primeval depths," which normally exist long before creation. Here wisdom is presented as the principle bestowing order on creation. Wisdom was present when Yahweh "established the heavens, . . . when he drew a circle on the surface of the deep [*ʿal-pᵉnê tᵉhôm*]" (v. 27). The passage reflects the notion, influenced by Babylonian cosmogony, that the earth is a disk surrounded and bounded by the primeval ocean,[35] with the dome of the heavens fixed above.[36] In Prov. 3:20, too, creation is due to the wisdom of Yahweh, for "by his knowledge the deeps *(tᵉhōmôṯ)* broke open and the clouds dropped down dew."

2. *Chaos and the Exodus.* In the context of passages dealing with creation, the *tᵉhôm* is present before the world even when it is counted among the works of Yahweh (Ps. 148:7; Prov. 8:24). In other passages, however, the reader gains the impression that the primeval deep is personified. For example, it is described as "reposing beneath the earth" (Gen. 49:25; Dt. 33:13), as "trembling" (Ps. 77:17[16]), and as "giving forth its voice" (Hab. 3:10; *rôm yāḏêhû* belongs with *šemeš* in the following verse[37]). Although the mythological background of these passages is still apparent, nowhere does *tᵉhôm* represent an independent power hostile to God.

The latter idea appears more clearly in the context of the battle with chaos, with the mythical sea monsters Leviathan and the sea serpent *(tannîn)* on the one hand and Rahab on the other. The first two are of Canaanite origin;[38] Rahab may be rooted in Babylonian mythology.[39] Even though they are of different origins, these three figures are linked. All three appear as chaotic beings (*liwyāṯān* and *tannîn*, Ps. 74:13-14; Isa. 27:1; *rahaḇ* and *tannîn*, Isa. 51:9) belonging to the sea *(yām)*, whose chaotic power they symbolize. A distant allusion may also be present in Job 41:24(32). In God's second response to Job (40:1–41:26), both the crocodile (Leviathan) and the hippopotamus (Behemoth) symbolize the sea's chaotic power. The description of the crocodile says: "It leaves a shining wake behind it; one would think the deep *(tᵉhôm)* to be white-haired" — a metaphorical allusion to the water that foams behind this untamed chaotic being.

Only in Isa. 51:9-10 and Ps. 148:7 is *tᵉhôm* associated directly with them. Ps. 148:7 calls on the sea monsters and deeps to praise the Creator; here their mythological background has largely vanished (cf. Gen. 1:21). Isa. 51:9-10, by contrast, refers quite explicitly to the primordial battle with chaos. In Deutero-Isaiah, however, creation and history are closely related; and thus here creation is so interwoven with Yahweh's deliverance at the Sea of Reeds that the drying up of the *tᵉhôm* functions as the connecting link. Therefore (contra Gunkel[40]) one should not argue on the basis of the parallel-

---

35. → תבל *tēḇēl*.

36. A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), I, 145-46.

37. *BHS;* W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 236.

38. → לויתן *liwyāṯān;* → תנין *tannîn.*

39. → רהב *rahaḇ.*

40. P. 32.

ism between *yām* and *tᵉhôm* that Rahab is a personification of *tᵉhôm*.[41] As the primeval ocean and home of Rahab, the *tᵉhôm* is also the water of the Sea of Reeds through which the Israelites escape.

The battle with chaos is also behind Ps. 77:17(16) and Hab. 3:10. Both passages describe the tumult of the cosmos, including the waters and the deep, at the theophany of Yahweh. Once again, Ps. 77 illustrates the interweaving of historical and mythological traditions. The way through the sea taken by Yahweh after his victory over the forces of chaos (v. 20[19]) turns into the path of Israel, led by Moses and Aaron (v. 21[20]). The identification of the battle with chaos with what happened at the Sea of Reeds is intended to present the miracle of Israel's deliverance as analogous to Yahweh's act of creation at the dawn of time, as an archetypal act of God, an event that shakes the very cosmos.

In Isa. 63:12ff. the parallel statements "He divided the waters before them . . . he led them through the depths like a horse through the desert" are grounded in purpose clauses: "to make for himself an everlasting name" (v. 12), "to make for yourself a glorious name" (v. 14). The simile of the desert *(miḏbār)* indicates that the *tᵉhōmôṯ* were left totally dry. The corresponding description in Ps. 106:9 is preceded by another allusion to the battle with chaos: "He rebuked the Reed Sea, and it became dry" (cf. Isa. 51:10). Here too the *tᵉhōmôṯ* are the site of the exodus. In Ex. 15 they cover the chariots of Pharaoh, which sink into the depths *(mᵉṣôlōṯ)* "like a stone" (v. 5), while for Israel they stand up as a wall and "congeal" *(qāp̄ā')* in the heart of the sea (v. 8).

Only in Ps. 78 do the *tᵉhōmôṯ* represent in this context not the waters of the Reed Sea but the miraculous provision of water in the desert. Just as Yahweh split the sea (v. 13), so he split the rocks in the wilderness, from which water poured in abundance, as from the primeval deep (v. 15).

3. *Cosmology.* In the contexts discussed above, *tᵉhôm* stands in the broadest sense for the primeval deep, bounded by God at creation. Thus the word suggests the dawn of time and a place far beyond the domain accessible and visible to human beings. It is therefore easy to understand that wisdom literature uses the noun in passages reflecting on Yahweh's creative power and inscrutable ways. According to Job 38:29-30, it is Yahweh who brings forth ice and hoarfrost, so that even the surface of the deep *(pᵉnê ṯᵉhôm)* appears frozen (*lāḵaḏ* hithpael). The point is not so much that the deep freezes like other water but that Yahweh can turn even the *tᵉhôm* to ice.[42] Spatial remoteness is conveyed when, in response to the question of where wisdom may be found, even the *tᵉhôm* must confess: "It is not in me" (28:14), or when Job is asked: "Have you come to the springs of the sea or walked to the recesses of the deep?" (38:16). This last passage strongly recalls the description of El's dwelling place.[43]

The *tᵉhōmôṯ hā'āreṣ* are "the subterranean waters of chaos, through which the deceased enters שׁאול. They represent the 'area of death.'"[44] Therefore the psalmist bears

41. → XIII, 356.

42. O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), 58 n. 211.

43. Kaiser, 47-50; see I.2 above.

44. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 73.

תּוֹלְדוֹת *tôlᵉḏôṯ*

I. Etymology, Occurrences, Meaning. II. Lists. III. The "Book" of the *tôlᵉḏôṯ*. IV. The *tôlᵉḏôṯ* Formula. V. Heaven and Earth. VI. LXX. VII. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology, Occurrences, Meaning. The noun *tôlᵉḏôṯ* occurs only as a construct plural; it derives from the root → ילד *yālaḏ* and is related to the hiphil *hôlîḏ*.[1] There are 39 occurrences in the OT, all in relatively late strata (P) and texts: *tôlᵉḏōṯām* (12 times in Nu. 1:20-42); *lᵉtôlᵉḏōṯām* (Gen. 10:32; 25:13; Ex. 6:16,19; 28:10 [*kᵉtôlᵉḏōṯām*]; 1 Ch. 5:7; 7:2,4,9; 8:28; 9:9,34; 26:31 [*lᵉṯōlᵉḏōṯāyw*]); *zeh sēper tôlᵉḏōṯ* (Gen. 5:1); *'ēlleh ṯōlᵉḏōṯ* PN (Gen. 2:4; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10,27; 25:12,19; 36:1,9; 37:2; Nu. 3:1; Ruth 4:18); *'ēlleh tōlᵉḏôṯām* (1 Ch. 1:29). "From the basic sense of the [substantive] it really means begetting, fathering, from which there has been a linguistic development to

---

tôlᵉḏôṯ. E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), esp. 432-46; J. Brinktrine, "Gen 2,4a, Überschrift oder Unterschrift?" *BZ* 9 (1965) 277; D. T. Bryan, "A Reevaluation of Gen 4 and 5 in the Light of Recent Studies in Genealogical Fluidity," *ZAW* 99 (1987) 180-88; K. Budde, "Ellä toledoth," *ZAW* 34 (1914) 241-53; idem, "Noch einmal 'Ellä toledoth,'" *ZAW* 36 (1916) 1-7; J. Cohen, "These Are the Generations of Isaac," *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 19 (1991) 260-64; O. Eissfeldt, "Biblos geneseōs," *KlSchr*, III (1966), 458-70; K. Friis Plum, "Genealogy as Theology," *SJOT* 3 (1989) 66-92; V. Fritz, "Das Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift," *ZTK* 84 (1987) 426-39; W. Gross, "Jakob der Mann des Segens," *Bibl* 49 (1968) 321-44; R. S. Hess, "The Genealogies of Genesis 1–11 and Comparative Literature," *Bibl* 70 (1989) 241-54; A. Jepsen, "Zur Chronologie des Priesterkodex," *ZAW* 47 (1929) 251-55; M. D. Johnson, *Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies. SNTSMS* 8 (²1988); J. Kegler, *Politisches Geschehen und theologisches Verstehen. CThM* A8 (1977) 19-25; K. Koch, "P — kein Redaktor," *VT* 37 (1987) 446-67; H.-J. Meysing, "Contribution à l'étude des généalogies bibliques," *RSR* 39 (1965) 209-29; M. Oeming, *Das wahre Israel. BWANT* 128 (1990); J. Prewitt, "Kinship Structures and the Genesis Genealogies," *JNES* 40 (1981) 87-98; B. Renaud, "Les généalogies et la structure de l'histoire sacerdotale dans le livre de la Genèse," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 595-608; J. M. Sasson, "A Genealogical 'Convention' in Biblical Chronography?" *ZAW* 90 (1978) 171-85; J. Scharbert, "Der Sinn der Toledot-Formel in der Priesterschrift," in H. J. Stoebe, ed., *Wort, Gebot, Glaube. FS W. Eichrodt. AThANT* 59 (1970), 45-56; N. Steinberg, "The Genealogical Framework of the Family Stories in Genesis," *Sem* 46 (1989) 41-50; S. Tengström, *Die Toledotformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch. CBOT* 17 (1982); H. N. Wallace, "The Toledot of Adam," in J. A. Emerton, ed., *Studies in the Pentateuch. SVT* 41 (1990), 19-31; P. Weimar, "Aufbau und Struktur der priesterschriftlichen Jakobsgeschichte," *ZAW* 86 (1974) 174-203; idem, "Struktur und Komposition der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung," *BN* 23 (1984) 81-134; idem, "Die Toledot-Formel in der priesterlichen Geschichtsdarstellung," *BZ* 18 (1974) 65-93; J. P. Weinberg, "Das Wesen und die funktionelle Bestimmung der Listen in I Chr 1–9," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 81-114; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (1983), esp. 137-66.

→ יָלַד *yālaḏ*; → VI, 79-80.

1. *HAL*, II, 1699-1700.

mean people who are related": offspring, descendants.[2] In the *tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ* formula (*'ēlleh tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ* PN), however, which sometimes appears apart from the genealogy proper with its list of names, the contextual meaning is more like "(family/clan) history."[3] In Gen. 2:4 the meaning is actually "beginnings." But the basic meaning is always present to some extent, at least in the texts belonging to P. Since these were interpolated into the existing narrative complex during the final redaction of the Pentateuch, the context is lost to the reader (cf. 25:19–35:29; 37:2–50:13; also 6:9–9:28, where P had already inserted extensive narrative material between the *tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ* formula and the notice of Noah's death). Thus *tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ* acquired a sense going beyond its basic meaning — already in P, but even more in the final form of the patriarchal narrative. What the word seeks to convey in the *tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ* formula must be determined from its context in P, since the formula belongs to P.

Ethnologists and sociologists have put forward various interpretations of the OT genealogies; these are summarized by Oeming.[4] The significance of genealogy in a "segmented society" as defining the ethnic obligation of mutual aid is cited increasingly by scholars interpreting Israel's beginnings (Sigrist, Malamat, Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Lohfink). The patrilineal social structure later finds expression in criticism of the monarchy (Crüsemann, Gottwald) or contrariwise in legitimation of the Davidic dynasty (Prewitt). Oeming summarizes the function and significance of the genealogies: they influence law (e.g., inheritance), politics (e.g., legitimation), sociology (e.g., prestige), history (source for historiography), psychology (e.g., identity), and religion (e.g., election, fatherhood of God).[5]

II. Lists. Nu. 1:20-47 (P^S) provides a theoretical muster roll of all able-bodied Israelite males in a highly formalized list of the twelve tribes, omitting Levi and splitting Joseph into Ephraim and Manasseh. The descendants *(tôl*ᵉ*ḏōṯ)* are identified by clans *(mišpāḥōṯ)* and extended families ("ancestral houses": *bêṯ 'āḇôṯ*), according to the number of their names ("individually, every male" in vv. 20,22). The result is an official register of available able-bodied men, categorized by their descent. This register ensures that all and only those are included who belong to a tribe through their extended family and clan, and hence to Israel. Using such lists, one could undertake at any time a review of men belonging to a particular category (1 Ch. 26:31).

This ability was also important for the postexilic temple community in Jerusalem. The so-called genealogical prelude to ChrH (1 Ch. 1–9), which Oeming appropriately calls a "proleptic summary,"[6] establishes theological accents that help determine the historical account that follows. It proves to be "a condensed version of the Chronicler's theology of election: Israel as the chosen nation in the midst of the nations, the tribes as a register of the holy lineage within which Yahweh has chosen David and his dynasty,

2. *HAL*, II, 1700.
3. Scharbert, 52-53.
4. Pp. 9-36.
5. Pp. 35-36.
6. Pp. 206-18, esp. 217.

problems of interpretation. The question whether it belongs with 1:1–2:3 or the text that follows must be answered in favor of the former. The word *ʾēlleh* can refer to what precedes or what follows.[16] Here it is a subscript summary corresponding to the superscription (1:1), to which it refers with the words "the heavens and the earth when they were created." The formula in 2:4a links creation with history (5:1; Nu. 3:1). At the same time, it sets creation apart from all other events as something unique. Here P also alludes to and rejects cosmogonies associated with theogonies, like those found among the Babylonians. The "beginnings" of heaven and earth and all that is in them, their *tôlᵉḏôṯ,* "are not begettings and births but manifold acts of Elohim, culminating in the commanding word of God."[17] P knows that only figuratively does the rain have "generative" power and the earth the power to "give birth" to plants and other living things (1:24); this power is conferred by God. God's work and God's blessing make the *tôlᵉḏôṯ* possible and bring them into being.

VI. LXX. The LXX translates *tôlᵉḏôṯ* with *génesis* (24 times), *syngéneia* (14 times), and *geneá* (once). Gen. 2:4 is close to 5:1 *(aútē hē bíblos genéseōs),* apparently associating 2:4a with the text that follows.

VII. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the documents of the Qumran community *twldwt* occurs 16 times (4 in 1QS, 3 each in 1QM and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, plus scattered others).[18] The use of the term is undoubtedly due to priestly influence in both life and thought. CD 4:5 calls the sons of Zadok the elect of Israel and refers to the list of their names according to their genealogies. The War Scroll (1QM 3:14) stipulates that, in addition to "people of God" and the names "Israel" and "Aaron," the great banner is to bear the names of the twelve tribes according to their genealogies, i.e., in birth order (cf. Nu. 2). The names of the tribes are to appear in like manner on the shield of the prince of the whole congregation, along with the names "Israel," "Levi," and "Aaron" (1QM 5:1). In 1QM 10:14 *twl[dwt]* alludes to Gen. 1 and 11; the sense of the fragmentary text is unclear. The meaning of the word may have more to do with origins than genealogy.

That is probably also the meaning of *twldwt* in 1QS; there 3:13–4:26 present the strict dualism of light and darkness, the two spirits, and their ways. In 3:13 the *maśkîl* is instructed to teach all the sons of light in the descent *(twldwt)* of all humanity that there are different spirits, which manifest themselves in the deeds of the various generations *(dwrwt).* Fundamentally, God has created two spirits, which determine the conduct of human beings: the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit. The origin *(twldwt)* of the former is in the realm of light, that of the second at the wellspring of darkness (3:19). These two spirits determine the origin *(twldwt)* and nature of all human beings, and all their generations *(dwrwt)* share in their divisions (4:15). It seems that, influ-

16. *HAL,* I, 52.
17. Kegler, 25.
18. → VI, 81.

enced by Gen. 2:4a and 5:1-2, 1QS has developed the meaning of *tôl^e^dôt* further in the direction of describing human nature.

The other occurrences are difficult or impossible to interpret. The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice speak of "seven songs of praise for his holiness . . . seven times with seven wondrous works." The context describes the praise of the Most High (4Q403 1 1:8-9//Masada ShirShabb 2:22-23). A fragmentary wisdom text (4Q418 77 2) speaks of the "generations of Adam" *(twldwt* [']*dm)* in a context that mentions understanding *(bynh)* and law *(mšpṭ)*. The texts of 4Q299 29 3; 4Q369 4 3; 4Q401 20 1; 4Q409 2 1; 4Q503 17 2 are damaged irreparably.

Schreiner

תּוֹלַעַת *tôla'aṯ;* תּוֹלֵעָה *tôlē'â;* תּוֹלָע *tôlā';* תלע *tl'*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Literal Meaning; 2. Metaphorical Meaning; 3. Color. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Heb. *tôlē'â/tôla'aṯ,* "worm,"[1] is related in meaning to Akk. *tūltu(m);*[2] Aram. *tôla'aṯ* (Old Aram. *twl'h;* in the Sefire inscriptions *twl'h* and locusts will devour the harvest of any party breaking the treaty[3]); Syr. *taul^e'ā';* Christian Palestinian Aram. *twl'';* Mand. *tulita,* "worm, embryo";[4] Amhar. *t^el* (originally *t^el'*).[5] The word probably derives from a lost root *tl',* "gnaw,"[6] if *m^etall^e'ôṯ,* "teeth" (Joel 1:6; Job 29:17; Prov. 30:14), is related (cf. also *malt^e'ôṯ,* "teeth," in Ps. 58:7[Eng. 6], with metathesis of *t* and *l*).

2. *Occurrences.* The word *tôlā'îm,* the plural of *tôlā',* "worm" (collective pl.[7]), occurs in Ex. 16:20. Twice *tôlā'* stands by metonymy for fabric dyed crimson with a dye made from the bodies of female scale insects (Isa. 1:18; Lam. 4:5; also in Imperial Aramaic[8]). The feminine form *tôlē'â* occurs twice in the OT (Isa. 14:11; Job 25:6; also Sir. 10:11). Another form with the feminine ending *t, tôla'aṯ,* occurs 4 times (Dt. 28:39; Isa. 41:14; Jon. 4:7; Ps. 22:7[6]). A suffixed form *tôla'tām* is found in Isa. 66:24.

1. *HAL,* II, 1702.
2. *AHw,* III, 1369.
3. *KAI* 222A.27.
4. *MdD,* 483.
5. W. Leslau, *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic* (Wiesbaden, 1969), 77.
6. F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1886), 113.
7. Michel, 64.
8. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the 5th Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1957), 37, 85-86 (letter 13:3).

Two pleonastic expressions denoting the color crimson or scarlet appear only in P: *tôla'at šānî* (27 times) and *šenî tôla'at* (6 times). The pual ptcp. *metullā'îm,* "(soldiers) clothed in crimson," is used in exactly the same sense (Nah. 2:4[3]).

The PN *tôlā'* occurs 6 times (Gen. 46:13; Nu. 26:23[bis]; Jgs. 10:1; 1 Ch. 7:1-2); the gentilic *tôlā'î* occurs in Nu. 26:23.

II. Usage.

1. *Literal Meaning.* It is often hard to determine the actual meaning of *tôlē'â.* The term probably covers not just worms in the strict sense but also caterpillars, maggots, and the larvae of beetles. In Dt. 28:39 the worm that will destroy the vineyards is either the leaf roller *(Byctiscus betulae)*[9] or the grape worm *(Cochylis ambiguella).*[10] In Jon. 4:7 God appoints an otherwise unspecified worm (or caterpillar[11]) to attack the castor bean plant that has been shading Jonah, causing it to wither rapidly and die.[12]

The maggots that destroy the manna are called *tôlā'îm* in Ex. 16:20 but *rimmâ* in v. 24. Even if the words belong to two different sources, their later treatment as synonyms indicates that the text is not thinking of a specific species; here generic "worms" or "maggots" are responsible for causing the manna to rot.

2. *Metaphorical Meaning.* a. Metaphorically, *tôla'at* represents a small, insignificant, powerless creature. No one is righteous before God, says Bildad (Job 25:6): a mortal is a maggot *(rimmâ)* and a worm *(tôlē'â).* Deutero-Isaiah addresses Israel as "you worm *(tôla'at)* Jacob" and *"metê yiśrā'ēl"* (Isa. 41:14; according to *BHS,* this is a hapax legomenon also meaning "worm," but more likely the text should be emended to *rimmat*). He exhorts the people not to fear, however, since Yahweh will help them. In Ps. 22:7(6) the psalmist describes himself as a worm and not a human being, scorned and despised.

b. We also find *tôla'at* used figuratively for the biological phenomenon of decomposition. According to Isa. 66:24, those who have rebelled against Yahweh will lie outside the city in the Valley of Hinnom (cf. 1 En. 27), "for their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched." The image of the worm that does not die stands for decomposition. What is unclear is whether new corpses of condemned unbelievers will keep the worm alive or the rebels condemned in a great last judgment will be tormented eternally by worm and fire. Apocalyptic literature takes the expression in the sense of eternal torment (cf. esp. 1 En. 46:6; Apoc. Ab. 31:4).[13]

Jth. 16:17 and Sir. 7:17 are probably dependent on Isa. 66:24. According to Jth. 16:17, Yahweh will punish the nations attacking Israel by "sending fire and worms into their flesh." Sir. 7:17 says: "The expectation of mortals is worms *(rimmâ).*" The LXX is

9. E. König, *Deuteronomium. KAT* III (1917), 191.

10. I. Löw, *Flora der Juden,* I (1924), 101-2.

11. W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 366.

12. G. Dalman, *AuS,* II (1932), 297.

13. P. Volz, *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Hildesheim, ²1966), 320-25.

closer to Isa. 66:24: "The punishment of the ungodly is fire and worm" (cf. also Mk. 9:48, which quotes Isa. 66:24).

3. *Color.* P uses the phrase *tôla'at šānî,* "crimson,"[14] for a dye used in outfitting the tent of meeting and in making the priestly vestments and the curtains veiling the cultic paraphernalia:[15] Ex. 25:4; 26:1–39:29 (25 times); Nu. 4:8. The phrase *šᵉnî tôla'at* refers to the "crimson" offered together with cedarwood and hyssop (Lev. 14:4,6,49,51-52; Nu. 4:8). According to Gradwohl,[16] this was a length of "yarn, ribbon, or cloth of this color used to wrap the cedarwood and hyssop."

As a color, *tôlā'* also appears in Isa. 1:18 in parallel with *šānî(m),* obviously chosen as a striking color to symbolize the gravity of the people's sins. The question is whether the verse promises the forgiveness of sins or is to be understood as a question demanding a negative answer: the sins are so grave that they cannot be forgiven.

III. 1. *LXX.* In 7 of its 8 occurrences, the LXX translates *tôlē'â* with *skṓlēx.* This term includes worms in the narrow sense, as well as maggots and larvae. Isa. 41:13b-14a is not in the LXX. Jerome consistently uses *vermis.* The LXX translates *tôla'at šānî* with *kókkinon*[17] *diploún,* the Vg. with *coccus bis tinctus,* "double-dyed scarlet"; both clearly interpret *šānî* as the ordinal numeral *šēnî.*

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls 1QM 7:11 uses *twl't šny* alongside *tklt* and *'rgmn* to describe the "crimson" war garments of the priests. Puech reconstructs the same form in 4Q525 2 3:5-6.[18] Fabry thinks instead of a "colorful portrayal of wisdom."[19] The word *twl'* appears by itself as the name of a color in 11QT 10:10,14; the very fragmentary column probably describes the curtains hanging in the vestibule of the temple. The sacrificial laws of Leviticus and Numbers[20] are reflected in 4Q276 1 6, a purification rule. Lam. 4:5bα is repeated verbatim in 4Q179 1 2:10. The small fragment 1Q53, where *ltwl't* appears without context in the first line, yields no further information.

The expression *twl't mtym* in 1QH 6:34 and 11:12 can hardly mean "men of vermin"[21] or "vermin that man is";[22] it must mean "worm of the dead." Nötscher[23] thought that this refers to resurrection (cf. 11:12: "to raise the worm of the dead from the dust

---

14. → שׁני *šānî.*

15. R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963), 76.

16. P. 77.

17. O. Michel, *TDNT,* III, 812-14.

18. É. Puech, *RB* 98 (1991) 86-87.

19. H.-J. Fabry, "Das Makarismus — mehr al seine weisheitliche Lehrform," in J. Haussmann and H.-J. Zobel, eds., *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und biblische Theologie. FS H. D. Preuss* (Stuttgart, 1992), 370.

20. See II.3 above.

21. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings from Qumran* (Eng. tr. Gloucester, 1973), 221.

22. Ibid., 237.

23. F. Nötscher, *BZ* 2 (1958) 132.

to an everlasting community"), but more likely "worm of the dead" is "an expression of abasement taken from the piety of poverty,"[24] used to characterize the lowliness of the faithful. In 11QPs[a] 19:1 (Plea) *twlʿh (// rmh)* stands metaphorically for the dead: "A maggot *(rmh)* cannot praise you, or a worm *(twlʿh)* tell of your goodness"; cf. the antithetical statement in l. 2 and the similar sequence of thought in Isa. 38:18,19a; the same theme appears also in Ps. 6:6(5), etc. The context of the occurrence in 2Q28 2 3 is too fragmentary to interpret.

Kellermann† — Ringgren

24. J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* II (Munich, 1960), 95.

תּוֹעֵבָה *tôʿēḇâ;* תעב *tʿb*

I. Etymology and Lexical Field. II. Verb. III. Noun: 1. Distribution; 2. Deuteronomy; 3. Dtr Literature; 4. Holiness Code; 5. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah; 6. Proverbs; 7. Summary. IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Lexical Field. As *HAL* shows,[1] the etymology of the *taqṭil* noun *tôʿēḇâ* is still obscure (possibly from a vb. *yʿb,* as found in Arabic[2]); the vb. *tʿb* is considered a denominative. The root is not found in the more ancient Semitic languages

tôʿēḇâ. M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (London, 1966, ²2002); B. Gemser, "The Importance of the Motive Clause in OT Law," *Congress Volume: Copenhagen 1953. SVT* 1 (1953), 50-66, esp. 57-60; E. Gerstenberger, "תעב *tʿb* pi. to abhor," *TLOT,* III, 1428-31; W. W. Hallo, "Biblical Abominations and Sumerian Taboos," *JQR* 76 (1985) 21-40; J. L'Hour, "Les interdits *toʿēbā* dans le Deutéronome," *RB* 71 (1964) 481-503; P. Humbert, "L'étymologie du substantif *toʿēbā*," in A. Kuschke, ed., *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 157-60; idem, "Le substantif *toʿēbā* et le verbe *tʿb* dans l'AT," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 217-37; R. G. Lehmann, "Greuel," *NBL,* I, 950-51; W. Paschen, *Rein und unrein. SANT* 24 (1970), esp. 28-30, 67-68; W. H. Pickett, "The Meaning and Function of 'TʿB/TOʿEVAH' in the Hebrew Bible" (diss., Hebrew Union College, Ohio, 1985); H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), esp. 12, 156-57, 160, 174, 197, 213; W. Richter, *Recht und Ethos. SANT* 25 (1966), esp. 158-61; E. Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung. EH* XXIII/162 (1982); Z. Weinberg, "When Is *twʿbh* Used?" *BethM* 22 (1977) 230-37.

1. *HAL,* II, 1702, 1765; cf. already Gerstenberger, 1428-29, and Pickett.

2. Humbert, *"L'étymologie";* and *HAL,* II, 1702; but cf., e.g., L. Kopf, *VT* 8 (1958) 188-89; cf. → VI, 150.

such as Akkadian and Ugaritic; it does appear in languages where we may suspect the influence of Biblical Hebrew (Samaritan [Dt. 26:7] and Middle Hebrew).[3] But the statement (using the root *tʿb*) that a particular act is an "abomination" to a god or goddess is found in a Phoenician mortuary inscription of the 6th century B.C.E.;[4] the same notion — but expressed by means of other roots — is commonplace among Israel's neighbors.[5] It is therefore unnecessary to rely solely on the OT evidence in investigating the meaning of the term.[6]

The verb and noun are closely related in both meaning and usage, often occurring in adjacent or identical texts (e.g., Dt. 7:25-26). The treatment of the verb and noun separately in the following discussion is simply for purposes of clarity.

II. Verb. The vb. *tʿb* is probably denominative. Within the OT it appears primarily in the piel (also Sir. 11:2), generally conveying a declarative or estimative sense ("abhor," "declare abhorrent").[7]

The text and interpretation of Am. 6:8 (possibly a piel ptcp. of *tʿb*, but written *tʾb*) and Isa. 49:7 (text often emended to a pual ptcp.)[8] are uncertain.

The earliest occurrence of the verb, in Am. 5:10, speaks of the abhorrence, in both thought and deed, that those who pervert justice (v. 7) have for honest witnesses.[9] Here and in Mic. 3:9, a similar text, the verb is still used in a strictly "secular" sense. A more general "loathing" is also meant in Isa. 14:19 (niphal); cf. also 1 Ch. 21:6 (niphal).[10] In Job 9:31 Job's very clothing can be disgusted with its wearer if he is smitten by God; his most intimate friends react similarly in 19:19 (cf. 30:10 and Ps. 88:9[Eng. 8] with the noun). Ps. 107:18 laments that the sick sometimes loathe any kind of food.

According to Ps. 5:7(6), Yahweh himself abhors those described as criminals by such texts as Am. 5:10 and Mic. 3:9. In Ps. 119:163 the faithful psalmist affirms that he abhors falsehood. In the survey of Israel's history in Ps. 106, Yahweh's abhorrence of his own people *(naḥᵃlāṯô)* takes on the function of epitomizing the psalm's interpretation of history (v. 40).

Dt. 7:26 requires Israel to abhor idols that are under the ban (cf. v. 5). In the so-called law of the assembly (Dt. 23:2-9[1-8]),[11] v. 8(7) (bis) states that Israel is not to abhor any of the Edomites, here (and therefore probably not until the postexilic period) referred to as "brothers," or any of the Egyptians, because the Israelites resided in their lands as aliens *(gēr)*. For the most part, however, Deuteronomy uses the noun, which

3. *HAL*, II, 1702.

4. *KAI* 13.6; C. Butterweck, *TUAT*, II/4, 590; cf. *DISO*, 332: to open a tomb "is an abomination to Astarte."

5. See below.

6. As maintained by Gerstenberger, 1429.

7. *HP*, 270.

8. Gerstenberger, 1428; *HAL*, II, 1766.

9. See the discussion of both verses by G. Fleischer, *Von Menschenverkäufern, Baschankühen und Rechtsverkehren. BBB* 74 (1989), 131-57.

10. See below.

11. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 142-43, with bibliog.

also appears in 7:25, preceding the use of the verb in v. 26.[12] This appearance of the verb in its cultic and exclusionary sense, albeit forcefully negated, is triggered by the use of the noun. Only in Ezk. 16:25 do we find a factitive piel — here applied to cultically faithless Jerusalem, which has made its beauty an abomination. A sapiential exhortation in Sir. 11:2 urges the hearer not to "loathe" anyone on the basis of ugliness alone.

The three instances of the niphal exhibit the passive use of the root. A branch may be loathed (Isa. 14:19); the commandment of David his king was abhorred by Solomon (1 Ch. 21:6).[13] Job 15:16, by contrast (in a context deliberately antithetical to Ps. 8:5-9[4-8]), emphasizes the distance that necessarily separates God from the sinner whose conduct arouses God's abhorrence.

The four instances of the hiphil characterize "abominable acts." Ahab acted abominably (1 K. 21:26) by going after foreign gods, as did Jerusalem/Judah by her licentious behavior (Ezk. 16:52; cf. v. 25). Finally, the godless in general do abominable deeds (Ps. 14:1 = 53:2[1]).

Many of these passages show that the verb (like the noun[14]) has many synonyms (see, e.g., Dt. 7:26; Isa. 49:7; Am. 5:10; Ps. 119:163; Job 19:18-19); but the root *t'b* nevertheless contributes its own semantic element to the lexical field (ethical and cultic taboo; usually represented in English by "abomination").

III. Noun.

1. *Distribution.* The 117 occurrences of the noun in the OT are distributed quite unevenly, with clearly recognizable concentrations within the OT corpus.[15] For example, the absence of the noun from the Psalms is striking, especially in view of its often noticeable ties to the cult. Hebrew Sirach provides three additional occurrences of the singular (13:20 [bis]; 15:13) and one of the plural (49:2).

In both the singular (e.g., Jer. 44:4 [Dtr]; Mal. 2:11) and the plural, *tô'ēḇâ* can characterize sinful departure from Yahweh on the part of Israel or individual Israelites (certain kings as exemplars); particular sins can also be subsumed under the category of "abominations." The plural, which often makes this summary appraisal especially clear, is found in Lev. 18:26,29,30; Dt. 18:9,12; 20:18; 32:16; 2 K. 16:3; 21:2; Jer. 16:18; 44:22; almost all the 43 occurrences in Ezekiel, with the exception of Ezk. 16:50; 18:12; 22:11; 33:26; and in the prayer in Ezr. 9 (vv. 11,14) as well as in the introduction to it (v. 1) — none of them early texts.

Within the corpus of early narrative, the noun appears only in Gen. 43:32; 46:34; Ex. 8:22(26) (bis; J?) — in each case observing that table fellowship with Canaanites is an "abomination" to the Egyptians, as is Israel's offering sacrifice to Yahweh within the bounds of Egypt. The Israelites were thus aware that other nations and religions, too, had exclusionary customs and requirements.

---

12. See below.
13. *HAL,* II, 1765.
14. See III below.
15. Distribution and nuances of meaning are also discussed by Humbert, *ZAW,* 72.

Only rarely does the noun appear outside theological contexts. Ps. 88:9(8) laments that Yahweh himself has made the psalmist a "thing of horror" to his friends (cf. Job 19:19, with the verb).

Of the OT legal texts, the Covenant Code (Ex. 20:22–23:33) uses neither the noun nor the verb; Deuteronomy and its dependent materials (the Dtr corpus and H), however, use them frequently to define what is ethically or cultically beyond the pale. The noun appears 43 times in Ezekiel; its cultic usage permeates the book. The other prophetic books have only 12 occurrences, many of which must be ascribed to Dtr redaction (5 in the book of Jeremiah). The only exceptions are Isa. 1:13; Jer. 2:7 (?); 6:15; 8:12.

Prophetic cultic polemic calls (incense) offerings an "abomination" committed by those who are also guilty of other transgressions (Isa. 1:13, in the form of a so-called declaratory formula[16]) — not just foreign cultic practices,[17] as is most often the case in more cultically oriented texts, but the offerings of Yahweh's own people. According to Jer. 2:7 (possibly exhibiting Dtr redaction), Israel has defiled the land given it by Yahweh (by turning aside to the Baals? cf. vv. 20-34), thus making Yahweh's *naḥ*ᵃ*lâ* an "abomination." Jer. 6:15 and 8:12 use the vb. → עשׂה *ʿśh* with the noun *tôʿēḇâ* (here without adding "to Yahweh"), a combination found also in later documents and texts, in the motivation sections of prophetic oracles of judgment.[18]

Besides the Dtn/Dtr material and other literature with cultic interests (H, Ezekiel), a second concentration of *tôʿēḇâ* appears surprisingly in proverbial literature, without cultic interests (21 times in Proverbs). There are in fact numerous parallels among Israel's neighbors.[19] The question must be asked as to which OT corpus that focuses on distinctiveness may have been influenced by the other. At the least, the frequent use of the term in proverbial literature creates difficulties for a one-sided attempt to trace the term to the realm of sacral law.

The noun, too, appears in parallel with several words and expressions that set Israel or even Yahweh apart from other human beings, their customs, and their gods. An act may be called "an outrage *(n*ᵉ*ḇālâ)* in Israel" (Gen. 34:7; Dt. 22:21; Josh. 7:15; Jgs. 20:6,10; Jer. 29:23; cf. Ex. 22:2[3]; Jgs. 19:23-24; 20:3), or we are told, "Such a thing is not done in Israel" (2 S. 13:12-13). Also: "You shall purge the evil from Israel [or: from your midst]" (Dt. 13:6; 17:7,12; 19:13,19-20; 22:21-22; etc.). Foreign gods and idols are called "monsters,"[20] or Yahweh is described as "hating" them (e.g., Dt. 12:31; Am. 5:21; Prov. 6:16). They are "unclean" in his eyes and for Israel;[21] they are "impure" *(niddâ)*.[22] Israel's ethical and cultic practice was strongly determined by a need

---

16. See below.
17. See below.
18. On the use of *tôʿēḇâ* in the book of Jeremiah, see also H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches*. *BZAW* 132 (1973), 42-43.
19. See III.6 below.
20. → שׁקוץ *šiqqûṣ*.
21. → V, 330.
22. → IX, 232-35.

But there are also ethical taboos. A man must not remarry a wife he has divorced (24:4), and accurate weights and measures must not be falsified (25:13-16); both are abominations to Yahweh. The latter demand in particular resembles certain wisdom texts.[29] Thus these *tô'ēḇâ* injunctions not only protect the purity of the cult (and not just from the practices of Israel's neighbors; cf. 17:1) but also prohibit conduct that is ethically incompatible with Yahweh and his people ("abomination in your midst": 13:15[14]). Israel must not adopt such practices (usually from its neighbors), because to do so would imperil its faith in Yahweh. With respect to Deuteronomy, therefore, it is wrong to say that Dtn/Dtr texts with *tô'ēḇâ* always refer to idols or idolatry (contra Schroer,[30] who assigns this meaning to all the Dtn as well as the Dtr texts, for which this claim is closer to the truth[31]).

In Dtn/Dtr texts, therefore, the use of the *tô'ēḇâ* concept is intimately associated with the idea of the people of God and the uniqueness and nature of Yahweh. Even though Deuteronomy exhibits clear affinities to OT wisdom (Proverbs),[32] among them the use of *tô'ēḇâ,* the semantic content of *tô'ēḇâ* in Deuteronomy is substantially different from that in Proverbs.[33]

3. *Dtr Literature.* The use of *tô'ēḇâ* in Dtr literature and the books dependent on it (Chronicles, Ezra) resembles closely many (though not all) texts in Deuteronomy, which may themselves be Dtr.[34] These texts, too, speak of the "abomination(s) of the nations," constantly adding both retrospectively and as a current threat to Israel that Yahweh drove out these nations before Israel (1 K. 14:24, again with *'śh* [cf. Dt. 12:31; 13:15[14]; 17:4; 2 K. 21:11];[35] also 2 K. 16:3; 21:2; cf. 2 Ch. 28:3; 33:2; 36:14; to 2 K. 24:5, 2 Ch. 36:8 adds that Jehoiakim was punished on account of the abominations that he did; also Ezr. 9:1,11,14). When these abominations are specified, they refer to persons, acts, objects (Dt. 7:25-26) and practices (temple prostitution, child sacrifice [?]); apostasy from Yahweh in general (2 K. 21:2,11: Manasseh), or the worship of foreign gods, whose cultic sites Josiah had defiled (2 K. 23:13) or removed (2 Ch. 34:33). Israel is to eschew all such abominations. According to Ezr. 9:14, the intermarriages of Israelites with other peoples were "abominations."

The passages in the book of Jeremiah not mentioned in III.1 above also belong to its Dtr redaction. It is just possible that Jer. 16:18 is a genuine oracle of Jeremiah. The verse ascribes the deportation to the abominable sin of worshiping dead idols (16:16-18), which are in fact no better than animal carcasses.[36] In Jer. 7:10 "abominations" is a

---

29. See III.6 below.

30. S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), 353.

31. See III.3 below.

32. Preuss, *Deuteronomium,* 84-90; see also III.7 below.

33. See III.6 below.

34. See also H.-D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. AThANT* 66 (1980), 359; G. Vanoni, *Literarkritik und Grammatik. ATS* 21 (1984), 223-26; Y. Minokami, *Die Revolution des Jehu. GTA* 38 (1989), 51-52.

35. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 112.

36. → X, 556.

collective term summarizing the preceding list of sins committed by the people, which they persist in committing. The "gods that you have not known" (end of v. 9) reappear in 19:4 and 44:3, as well as other Dtn/Dtr texts (Dt. 11:28; 13:3,7[2,6]; etc.). Immediately associated with Jer. 44:3 are 44:4 and 22, where "abomination" (pl. in v. 22) is again a general collective term for apostasy from Yahweh. Jer. 32:35 (Dtr) resembles Dt. 12:31 and 2 K. 16:3. In the hymn honoring ancestors, Sir. 49:2 says that Josiah put an end to *(yšbt),* "the abomination of idols *(hbl).*"

4. *Holiness Code.* Generally speaking, most of the occurrences in H (Lev. 17–26) do not add much to what we have already learned about the meaning of "abomination to Yahweh."[37] Almost all of them are in H's reworking of Dtn ordinances.[38] "Abomination" refers to sins, both present and past, against Yahweh's will in general (18:26, 27,29) or even the "ordinances" of foreigners, which Israel must not follow (18:30). Only 18:22 and 20:13 are more specific. The former appears in a series of apodictic prohibitions of certain sexual offenses (18:18-23); these clearly have the character of sacral law and according to 20:13 even carry the death penalty. The statement that "it is an abomination" adds a justifying element to one of these apodictic laws (cf. the use of different words in 18:17b,22b,23b).[39]

It is striking that the word *tô'ēḇâ* does not appear in P — apart from H, incorporated into it — or the Psalms (its single occurrence in Ps. 88:9[8] points in a totally different direction). This observation also argues against tracing the notion of *tô'ēḇâ* too narrowly to the realm of the cult and sacral law.

5. *Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.* There are more occurrences of *tô'ēḇâ* (43) in Ezekiel than in any other book. It is usually in the plural, the only exceptions being Ezk. 16:50; 18:12; 22:11; 33:26. The verb also appears in 16:25,52 (bis).[40] The addition of a suffix ("your abominations") is not uncommon, since the mention of these abominations of Israel, Judah, and Jerusalem often appears in the motivating sections (formulated as direct address) of indictments, oracles of judgment, and historical summaries of the "history of apostasy" (cf. only 16:2: "Mortal, make known to Jerusalem her abominations").

This holds true for both the authentic oracles of Ezekiel and the various strata and expansions of the book.[41] The very first instance of such use in an oracle of judgment ("because of all your abominations," 5:9) is a generalized summary of sin;[42] as is typical in the book of Ezekiel, v. 11 goes on to give the sin concrete instantiation: "defile-

37. See also C. Feucht, *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitsgesetz* (Berlin, 1964), 56.

38. H. D. Preuss, *TRE,* XIV, 715.

39. For an analysis of Lev. 18 see esp. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 229-42; → תבל *tēḇēl* V.

40. See II above.

41. See in general W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel. Herm,* 2 vols. (Eng. tr. 1979-83).

42. T. Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch. BZAW* 180 (1989), 83; see also the discussion of *tô'ēḇâ* on pp. 83-84, 177.

abominations, which brought judgment on them as well (44:6-7). But the Levites must bear the consequences of the abominations they have committed (44:13), and will be limited to performing menial services. Thus the *tô'ēḇâ/ôṯ* theme pervades the entire book of Ezekiel, characterizing the sinful relationship of Israel/Judah/Jerusalem, including the priests and Levites, to Yahweh, as well as its positive denouement.

6. *Proverbs.* The 21 occurrences in the book of Proverbs (always sg. except in 26:25; cf. also 6:16 *K*) constitute a distinct group. When ethical matters are involved, these occurrences resemble certain texts in Deuteronomy as well as texts in the social criticism of the prophets. In other cases they have their own semantic nuances, which also appear in the wisdom literature of Israel's neighbors.

Fools find it an abomination to turn away from evil (Prov. 13:19; despite LXX, there is no need to emend the text); here "abomination" is antithetical to "desire, longing." For kings, doing evil is an abomination (16:12). Here — as in "an abomination to Yahweh" — "abomination" is the opposite of "delight." This verse and the next show that the text refers to the actions of kings themselves, not primarily the actions of their subjects (cf. vv. 12b,13b). According to 24:9, a scoffer is an abomination to all. The sage cautions that a slanderer has seven (i.e., "many," or perhaps "only" [cf. 6:31; 24:16]) abominations (*tô'ēḇôṯ;* the only instance of the plural in Proverbs) in his heart, mind, and will, and is therefore not to be trusted. The unjust are an abomination to the righteous; conversely, the upright are an abomination to the wicked (29:27, concluding the minor collection in chs. 28–29). The two are incompatible and mutually dangerous (cf. "an abomination to the Egyptians"[47]).

Nothing is said of an "abomination to Yahweh," so that it is misleading to find the "abomination formula" here, even in modified form, as maintained by Plöger.[48] The texts deal with interpersonal matters that are abhorrent and dangerous, not with religious matters; they neither presuppose nor suggest that this abhorrence derives from Yahweh's abhorrence. For example, what 16:6 says about "avoiding evil" is not (yet) addressed in 13:19; and in 24:9 it is wrong to insert "and to God" alongside "to all,"[49] the other persons whose enmity the scoffer arouses. The later chapters of Proverbs, too, use "abomination" in a manner that is not strictly religious, e.g., in 8:7: wickedness is an abomination not found on the lips of wisdom as she invites a hearing. Since some texts in the book of Proverbs do use the expression "abomination to Yahweh," it would be mistaken simply to insert or understand "to Yahweh" wherever it does not appear explicitly (cf. the texts of Israel's neighbors[50]).

Prov. 21:27 and 28:9 also use "abomination" without explicit qualification, but in both cases "to Yahweh" should probably be understood (sacrifices offered by the wicked are an abomination [cf. 15:8 and Isa. 1:13]; the prayer of one who does not listen to *tôrâ* is an abomination).

---

47. See III.1 above.

48. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), on these passages; cf. also the index s.v.

49. As does A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), II, 404.

50. See below.

In the earlier wisdom material (Prov. 11:1,10; 12:22; 15:8,9,26; 16:5; 17:15; 20:10,23), the phrase "abomination to Yahweh" does occur as a solemn formula, usually at the beginning of a hemistich (the only exceptions being 11:1 and 15:8[51]). False weights and balances are an abomination to Yahweh (11:1; cf. 20:10,23), as also in Dt. 25:13-16. Crooked minds, evil plans, and lying lips are an abomination to Yahweh (Prov 11:20; 12:22; 15:26; 16:5). The antithesis is Yahweh's delight (cf. 16:12-13) or love (15:9). The way and the sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to Yahweh (15:8-9), as is the conduct of those who pervert justice (17:15; cf. Isa. 5:23; Am. 5:7; 6:12b).

Prov. 6:1-19 is an interpolation into chs. 1–9; vv. 16-19 are a numerical proverb that lists seven kinds of ethical (not cultic!) misconduct that are an abomination (6:16 *K:* abominations) to Yahweh; the passage is almost a proleptic summary of chs. 10–29(31). Among the later texts of the book of Proverbs, 3:32 turns many of the specific "abominations" in earlier texts into a more fundamental statement. In the book of Proverbs, then, "abomination (to Yahweh)" can refer to both inward attitudes and outward acts.

Studies of *tô'ēḇâ* in Proverbs often cite parallels in Egyptian wisdom texts, especially the Teaching of Amenemope, portions of which have been incorporated (with some changes) into Prov. 22:17–23:11 (plus 24:10,12).[52] The Egyptian equivalent *bw.t*[53] does appear in Amenemope with the meaning "abhorrence, abomination"; typical is 13.15-16: lying speech is *bw.t nṯr,* "an abomination to the deity"; cf. 14.2: he "hates" such conduct; 15.20-21: a scribe must not use his skill to the detriment of others, for "that is abhorrent to the deity"; 18.21–19.1: whoever uses a false measure is abhorrent to Re. None of these passages, however, has been incorporated directly in Proverbs (but cf. Amenemope 18.21–19.1 with Prov. 11:1; 20:10,23), and *tô'ēḇâ* does not appear in Prov. 22:17–23:11.

It is nevertheless impossible to ignore the notion of "abhorrence, abomination," which appears in other Egyptian texts as well. As in the OT, it is found not only in sapiential texts (Ani 4.1: a din in the house of the deity is an abomination "to him"; Ptah-hotep 8, end: speaking of someone else is an abomination to the *ka;* Ankh-Sheshonq 4.20: abhorrence of Re is groundless captivity); but it occurs already in the Pyramid Texts[54] and the Book of the Dead (112: swine are abhorrent to Horus; 125A: "I have done nothing that the gods abhor"). Similar passages appear in priestly and royal cleansing confessions and idealized biographies:[55] lying is abhorrent to the gods; inflammatory speech is abhorrent to "me." Individuals can also be abhorrent to others (a Lybian chieftain to Memphis[56]).

Because Gen. 43:32; 46:34; Ex. 8:22 speak of something that is "an abomination to

51. Meinhold, *Sprüche,* I, 185.
52. D. Römheld, *Wege der Weisheit. BZAW* 184 (1989).
53. *WbÄS,* I, 553.
54. Humbert, *ZAW* 72:221; *WbÄS,* I, 74.
55. J. Assmann, *Ma'at* (Munich, 1990), 144, 158-212.
56. U. Kaplony-Heckel, *TUAT,* I/6, 548.

the Egyptians," scholars have repeatedly cited Egyptian texts documenting this notion, while ignoring the existence of analogous ideas in Mesopotamian religions.[57] In the Babylonian creation epic, Apsu finds the conduct of the other gods abhorrent.[58] A Sumerian proverb observes that a wild ox is not suited to a plow (Sum. *níg-gig,* "taboo").[59] Other Sumerian proverbs, too,[60] probably name things that anyone should find abhorrent, such as eating in a way that a dog eats, as well as actions forbidden at certain times.[61]

In Akkadian, *ikkibu(m)* denotes something impermissible or improper (lying, loathing) as well as something forbidden by the gods, something abhorrent — including both (un)ethical conduct and cultic transgressions.[62] A thief is an abomination to others,[63] as is eating leeks to someone who is sick.[64] The fact that birds devour so much barley every day is actually an abomination to the gods.[65] A king abhors lying.[66] And even a god can be described as abhorring someone or something, e.g., eating a certain kind of mouse (?) is abhorrent to Enlil. Certain parts of an animal are an abomination to the "dead" god Enmesharra.[67] One wisdom saying declares that failure to provide something one has promised (?) is an abomination to Marduk.[68] Sperm is an abomination to the gods.[69] Swine are an abomination to all gods,[70] the temple,[71] and even the guardians of the netherworld.[72] A certain kind of speech is an abomination to the gods;[73] crossing a river is an abomination to Ea. Initiation of the uninitiated is an abomination to several gods, as is entering a cultic site in a state of impurity[74] and some other cultic (?) transgressions.[75]

In Mesopotamian texts, too, we can therefore speak of certain things, persons, and actions that are abhorrent or even taboo to both human beings and the gods. "In later texts, *ikkibu* is reduced to a more or less vague synonym of words for 'sin' and also denotes . . . the punishment incurred by the infringement of the interdict."[76]

---

57. Following Humbert, *ZAW* 72:221.
58. EnEl, I, 37.
59. E. J. Gordon, *JCS* 12 (1958) 11, proverb 5.3; cf. fr. 1.23 in idem, *Sumerian Proverbs* (1959, repr. New York, 1968), 53.
60. Gordon, *Sumerian Proverbs,* 60 (1.40), 258 (2.110); cf. *CAD,* VII, 55.
61. Gordon, *Sumerian Proverbs,* 132 (1.172).
62. *AHw,* I, 368-69; *CAD,* VII, 55-57, with many additional examples.
63. E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier,* I (Berlin, 1931), 13 (2.9).
64. Ibid., 56 (11.30).
65. *CAD,* VII, 56.
66. Ibid.
67. Ebeling, 33 (7.29).
68. *BWL,* 106.
69. *CAD,* VII, 56.
70. *BWL,* 215.
71. *CAD,* VII, 56.
72. Ibid., 55-56.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid., 56; Ebeling, 111 (27, 30).
75. Maqlû, V, 80.
76. *CAD,* VII, 57.

The occurrences of *tôʿēḇâ* in Sirach (except for 49:2[77]) stand clearly in the sapiential tradition. Humility is an abomination to the proud, a poor person to the rich (13:19,20). Yahweh hates evil as an abomination (15:13).

7. *Summary.* Within the OT, then, *tôʿēḇâ* refers to something in the human realm that is ethically abhorrent, either as an idea or as an action; above all it is irreconcilable with Yahweh, contrary to his character and his will as an expression of that character, an ethical and cultic taboo.[78] To call something *tôʿēḇâ* is to characterize it as chaotic and alien, and therefore dangerous, within the cosmic and social order.[79] The concept of a negative taboo is also familiar among Israel's neighbors. Because the noun (as well as the verb) enjoys such a wide range of usage in the OT, it is difficult to arrive at a single root significance of everything characterized as *tôʿēḇâ*.[80] Sapiential and legal material stand side by side with cultic material in the great majority of instances. "The word may have also been used simultaneously in several areas of life to guard against that which was foreign or strange."[81]

This wide-ranging usage is also suggested by the equivalents in other areas of the ancient Near East. Steiert's argument that the term derives exclusively from the language of the priesthood and cult[82] can be maintained neither for the OT, where it is not used by P or the Psalms,[83] nor for the religious world of Israel's neighbors.[84] By using *tôʿēḇâ* in the formula *tôʿēḇaṯ yhwh,* which appears only in Deuteronomy and Proverbs, Deuteronomy clearly attempted to integrate wisdom, law, and the cult into an epitome of Yahweh's will in the broadest sense. The central concern of Deuteronomy in particular, but also of the prophets and the OT law codes, is to preserve and maintain the people of God as a community living correctly in a manner consonant with Yahweh.

IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX uses *bdélygma* 68 times to translate *tôʿēḇâ,* but it also uses it 17 times for *šiqqûṣ*. This usage is similar to that of the NT.[85] The translator(s) of Ezekiel, by contrast, uses *bdélygma* 13 times for *tôʿēḇâ,* but also uses *anomía,* which is not found with this meaning in the NT.[86] The other 18 equivalents in the LXX appear only from one to four times. The vb. *tʿb* is generally represented by *bdelýssein/bdelýttein.*

In a later period "separation" is a major theme, e.g., in the book of Jubilees, strongly

---

77. See III.3 above.

78. For a more detailed discussion see Pickett, 69ff.

79. See Douglas.

80. Pickett: anti-Canaanite.

81. Gerstenberger, 1431; cf. Humbert, *ZAW* 72:236: "a great variety of applications."

82. F.-J. Steiert, *Die Weisheit Israels. FThSt* 143 (1990), 110-11.

83. See III.4 above.

84. On Egyp. *bw.t* see P. J. Frandsen, in G. Eglund and P. J. Frandsen, eds., *Crossroad* (Copenhagen, 1986), 145-59.

85. J. Zmijewski, *EDNT,* I, 209-10.

86. M. Limbeck, *EDNT,* I, 106.

clear. 11QT 48:6 cites Dt. 14:3, and 11QT 55:6 cites Dt. 13:15(14). 11QT 52:4-5 (like Dt. 17:1) adds concrete detail to Dt. 13:15. In Dtn/Dtr style, 11QT 60:17,19 (cf. 62:16) warn against the "abominations of the nations" (cf. Dt. 18:9-13): it is on account of these abominations that Yahweh is driving these nations out before Israel (11QT 60:20). 11QT 66:14,17 cite Lev. 18:29, expanding on Lev. 18 and labeling the forbidden acts abominations.

Preuss†

תור *twr*

I. Meaning, Etymology, Distribution. II. Usage. III. LXX.

I. Meaning, Etymology, Usage. The vb. *twr,* "investigate, spy out," is also common in Middle Hebrew[1] (cf. also Eth. *tōra,* "peer"[2]). Its etymology is obscure. Without semantic criteria, scholars have postulated a basic meaning "wander about"[3] and claimed a connection with Ugar. *ytr*[4] and (assuming also a relationship with Akk. *târu(m),* "turn"[5]) *tr,* "reconnoiter."[6] But it is impossible to identify the root and the meaning of *tr*[7] and *ytr*[8] with certainty, and in Akkadian texts *târu(m)* never refers to geographical exploration, the focus of OT usage.

Also quite uncertain are Gray's proposal[9] to associate *twr* with Arab. *tāra* IV, "repeat,"[10] making the basic meaning "go back and forth," and the citation of OSA *twrt,* "defensive weapon."[11] Other lexicographers[12] have suggested a relationship with the root **t'r,*[13] citing for *t'r* I Syr. *ta'ar,* "perceive," and Christian Palestinian Aram. **t'r,* "observe, examine."[14] The Aramaic lexeme *twr* already exhibits a broadening of meaning: the Samaritan dialect uses it to express perception and knowledge in general.[15] In

1. Jastrow, 1656; Levy, *WTM,* IV, 633.
2. Leslau, *Contributions,* 55.
3. *GesB,* 874; M. Noth, *Könige I: 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 204; *HAL,* II, 1708.
4. *TO,* I, 270 n. o.
5. *AHw,* III, 1332-36.
6. *TO,* I, 283 n. m'; also S. B. Parker, *UF* 21 (1989) 286.
7. M. Dijkstra and J. C. Moor, *UF* 7 (1975) 191; cf. K. Aartun, *UF* 17 (1985) 40-41; *UT,* nos. 2539, 2595.
8. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980) 399-400, with n. 9; cf. *WUS,* no. 1257.
9. J. Gray, *I and II Kings. OTL* (^{2}1970), 264-65.
10. G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (Halle, 1837), 59, 194-95.
11. W. W. Müller, *ZAW* 75 (1963) 316.
12. *HAL,* II, 1708.
13. *HP,* 214: "make outlines."
14. *HAL,* II, 1676.
15. *LOT,* III/2, 154.

the Dead Sea Scrolls "hardness of heart" is both the cause and the result of a false "perspective," a fundamental attitude of certain persons toward God (1QH 4:15; CD 3:11; see also CD 2:16 and 4Q504 5 2:5).

There is also the separate problem of whether the noun *tôr* I, "turn (in a sequence)," is associated etymologically with *twr.*[16] The primarily linear aspect of the noun suggests a different etymology; more likely, both *tôr* I and *ṭûr* derive phonetically and semantically from Egyp. *ỉdr,* "bind."[17]

It is also worth considering whether (as in Akkadian[18]) biradical verbs with a long vowel may be associated with certain semantic classes, so that in the case of *twr* (like Akk. *ḫiaṭum,* "espy"[19]) we have a fientic verb expressing terminative and resultative action, implying the profitable result of reconnoitering.[20]

The emphasis on the positive aspect of investigation in identifying the purpose and goal of the action (often expressed by an infinitive construction: Nu. 13:16-17,32; 14:7,36) is what distinguishes *twr* from other verbs belonging to the lexical field of "investigation." The most common of these is *rgl* piel (Nu. 21:32; Dt. 1:24; Josh. 6:25; 7:2; 14:7; Jgs. 18:2,14,17; 2 S. 10:3; 1 Ch. 19:3; often as a participle: Gen. 42:9,11,14,16,30-31,34; Josh. 2:1; 6:22-23; 1 S. 26:4; 2 S. 15:10). Spies investigate a land or city by walking about (cf. Akk. *dâlu*[*m*], "walk about,"[21] and its derivative *dayyālu,* "spy"[22]). The purpose of the enterprise may be indicated (Gen. 42:9,12) or a concrete privative action may be cited (e.g., Nu. 21:32; Dt. 1:24). The unflattering reputation of spying is shown by the response of Joseph's brothers to his insinuation that they have come to spy out Egypt: they insist that they are honest men (*kēn,* Gen. 42:11,31,33-34).

The semantic differentiation of *twr* is clear from the other verbs used beside *rgl: r'h* (Gen. 42:9,12; Josh. 2:1), *ḥpr* (Josh. 2:2-3), *rgl* and *ḥqr* (Jgs. 18:2), *ḥqr* and *ḥpr* (1 Ch. 19:3 [emended]). The use of → ראה *r'h* can suggest desertion (Jgs. 1:24-25; 1 S. 22:9), spying in the service of domestic politics (1 S. 23:23; 26:5; 2 K. 6:13), or demonstrable success (Josh. 8:21; Jgs. 9:43; etc.) or failure (Josh. 8:14; Jgs. 9:36; etc.); *ḥqr*[23] (Jgs. 18:2; 2 S. 10:3; 1 Ch. 19:3) stands for rational assessment of what is observed; *ḥpr* (Dt. 1:22; Josh. 2:2-3) is an archaizing poetic term for exploration.[24] Of these verbs only *r'h* appears directly alongside *twr* (Nu. 13:21-22; Dt. 1:33). Other verbs used in parallel with *twr* include *yd'* and *bqš* (Eccl. 7:25), *drš* (Eccl. 1:13),[25] *šmr* (Jgs. 1:23-24), and *t'h* (Prov. 12:26). They do not define a specific semantic realm, since more than three-

16. *GesB,* 874 (with a question mark); Even-Shoshan, 1224.

17. M. Görg, *BN* 27 (1985) 11-17 = *Aegyptica — biblica. ÄAT* 11 (1991), 72-78.

18. *GaG,* §104c-e.

19. *GaG,* §104e.

20. Similarly M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist. AThANT* 67 (1981), 274-75.

21. *AHw,* I, 154-55.

22. *AHw,* I, 150.

23. → חקר *ḥāqar.*

24. → חפר *ḥāpar.*

25. A. Fischer, *ZAW* 103 (1991) 75-76; R. Braun, *Kohelet und die frühhellenistische Popularphilosophie. BZAW* 130 (1973), 51.

Only one text within the scope of the wilderness and occupation tradition uses *twr* apart from a concrete "geographical" context. A parenetic adaptation of Priestly tradition (Nu. 15:37-41) speaks of the futile attempt to rely on one's own heart and eyes (v. 39: *wᵉlōʾ-ṯāṯurû ʾaḥᵃrê lᵉḇaḇkem wᵉʾaḥᵃrê ʿênêḵem ʾᵃšer-ʾattem zōnîm ʾaḥᵃrêhem*) instead of obeying the commandments of Yahweh. That we are not dealing simply with a weakened sense of the verb ("follow")[33] is shown by the immediate context of the exodus tradition (v. 41) as well as the extended context of Israel's wilderness wandering, alluded to here with the references to perversion of investigation in the broadest sense *(twr ʾaḥᵃrê).*

In the passage dealing with Solomon's income in gold (1 K. 10:14-15//2 Ch. 9:13-14), some scholars have proposed interpreting *hattārîm* as a participle; if the basic meaning of the verb is "go back and forth"[34] or "wander about,"[35] the participle could refer to traders, merchants either from abroad or in the service of the king. This interpretation, however, is entirely hypothetical. Emendation to *taggārîm,* "merchants,"[36] is problematic, since the lexeme is not attested in Classical Hebrew and this occupational group is already represented in the text by *hārōḵᵉlîm.* Possibly this late, post-Dtr text[37] includes terms without clear historical roots; possibly we should think of itinerant agents charged with collecting compulsory levies (reading *mēʿonšê* instead of *mēʾanšê*).

Job 39:8, cited only in Mandelkern's concordance,[38] is clearer. Here *yᵉṯûr* should be emended to *yāṯûr,*[39] with *twr* and *drš* in parallel, as in Eccl. 1:23: the wild ass searches for greenery, for which it searches the mountains.

In Ecclesiastes the vb. *twr* has become detached from the historical traditions. Here, as in Nu. 15:39, it is the heart, the organ of knowledge, that is involved in the search for wisdom (*ḥoḵmâ,* Eccl. 1:13; 7:25). Therefore the enjoyment of wine also opens the door to folly (2:3, *tartî bᵉlibbî*). When the search for wisdom aims at "finding an answer to the question of the meaning, nature, and worth of everything that takes place,"[40] the pleonastic use of *twr* and *drš* in 1:13 and *ydʿ, twr,* and *bqš* in 7:25 shows how variously the debate over vital questions is envisioned. That the enterprise of the sages involves not just mental processes but also experimental observation that leads to "orientation" is shown by the use of the vb. *twr* in wisdom literature.[41]

A final sapiential instance of *twr* is in Prov. 12:26, a difficult verse that contrasts the

33. As suggested, e.g., by P. J. Budd, *Numbers. WBC* 5 (1975), 178.

34. E. Würthwein, *Könige I: 1.Kön. 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1977), 122 n. 1.

35. Noth, *Könige I,* 204, 228-29.

36. E.g., W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 222.

37. Würthwein, *Könige I,* 122-23.

38. P. 1241.

39. Contra G. Gerleman, in M. Heerma van Voss et al., eds., *Travels in the World of the OT. FS M. A. Beek. SSN* 16 (1974), 74, who retains the noun *yᵉṯûr,* which he interprets as "that which is outstanding"; but cf. the 11QtgJob (Beyer, 295-96), which may interpret the word as a verb.

40. A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 45.

41. See also J. Pedersen, *RHPR* 10 (1930) 331.

way of the wicked, which leads astray, to the investigations of the righteous.[42] But the words are ambiguous. The MT *(yāṯēr mērēʿhû ṣaddîq)* can be translated: "Let the righteous find out from his neighbor" or "May the righteous find out more than his neighbor." (Ignoring *min,* Meinhold takes a different approach: "The righteous helps his friend find out [something], but the way of the wicked leads astray.")[43] The first possibility is the more likely and is supported by the LXX *(epignṓmōn díkaios).* The conjectural reading *yāṯir mirʿēhû ṣaddîq,* "the righteous keeps a lookout on his pasture," is no improvement. Emendation to *yāsur mērāʿâ ṣaddîq,* "the righteous turns aside from evil,"[44] requires substantial alteration of the text.

III. LXX. Of the various possibilities available to the LXX for translating Heb. *twr,* the one used most often is *kataskopeísthai.* It is used exclusively in the story of the spies in Nu. 13–14, but it appears also in Nu. 10:33 and the three texts in Ecclesiastes. (In Nu. 21:1, where the MT has the toponym *hāʾᵃṯārîm,* SP MSS read *h'twrym,* "spies," while Aq. and Symm. have *kataskopoí.*) In Nu. 15:39 *diastréphein (opísō tṓn dianoiṓn diánoia)* foregrounds the negative connotation, but without mentioning the "heart" spoken of in the MT. The divergence of the LXX from the MT is especially striking in Jgs. 1:23, where *parembállein* totally omits the notion of spying, and in Ezk. 20:6, where Yahweh's searching out of the land is replaced by an unmistakably positive *hetoimázein.* In Dt. 1:33 a similar reformulation (greatly amplified in Vg.) uses *eklégein* to dissociate Yahweh from the work of a spy.

In the difficult text Prov. 12:26, the LXX interprets the "neighbor" as a "counselor,"[45] clarifying the meaning by adding two verses not present in the MT: "The counsels of the godless are unseemly, sinners pursue evil." In 1 K. 10:15 it translates *hattārîm* contextually as *tetagménoi,* "subordinates," and mentions their tribute explicitly *(phóros).*

Liwak

42. See also the apparatus of *BHS* at 1 Ch. 17:17; but cf. T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. FRLANT* 106 (1972), 154.

43. A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche. ZBK* 16, 2 vols. (1991), I, 213.

44. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 147.

45. See II above.

תּוֹרָה *tôrâ*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences: 1. Frequency; 2. Syntax and Style; 3. Verbs; 4. Parallelisms; 5. Types. III. Usage: 1. Non-Priestly Tetrateuch; 2. P and Ezekiel; 3. Deuteronomy and DtrH; 4. Prophets; 5. Psalms; 6. Proverbs and Job; 7. ChrH and Daniel. IV. Concluding Observations: 1. Origin and Early Development; 2. Deuteronomy; 3. Canon. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

tôrâ. W. F. Albright, "The Names 'Israel' and 'Judah' with an Excursus on the Etymology of Tôdâh and Tôrâh," *JBL* 46 (1927) 151-85; S. Amsler, "Loi orale et loi écrite dans le Deutéronome," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium. BETL* 68 (1985), 51-54; R. A. Anderson, "Torah: Burden or Joy?" *ABR* 21 (1973) 1-6; B. Barc, "Le texte de la Torah a-t-il été récit?" in M. Tardieu, ed., *Les règles de l'interprétation* (Paris, 1987), 69-88; J. Barr, "Biblical Law and the Question of Natural Theology," in T. Veijola, ed., *The Law in the Bible and in Its Environment. PFES* 51 (1990), 1-22; E. G. Bauckmann, "Die Proverbien und die Sprüche des Jesus Sirach," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 33-63; A. I. Baumgarten, "The Torah as a Public Document in Judaism," *SR* 14 (1985) 17-24; E. Beauchamp and J. P. de Relles, "La gloire de dieu et la loi (Psaume 119)," *BVC* 50 (1963) 33-45; W. J. Beecher, "Torah," *JBL* 24 (1905) 1-16; J. Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," in P. Volz et al., eds., *Werden und Wesen des AT. BZAW* 66 (1936), 63-88 = *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 232-60; S. H. Blank, "The LXX Renderings of OT Terms for Law," *HUCA* 7 (1930) 259-83; P. J. Botha, "The Theological Function of the Semantic Field of 'Torah' in the Relationship Jahweh — the Petitioner — the Enemy in Psalm 119" (diss., Pretoria, 1987); G. Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' in Buch Deuteronomium," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 39-66 = *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 11-38; idem, "Gesetz als Evangelium," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 127-60 = *Studien*, 123-60; idem, "Law as Gospel," *Int* 38 (1984) 5-14; C. Breen, "The Psalms of the Law," *Furrow* 15 (1964) 516-25; G. J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in H. Merklein et al., eds., *Bibel in jüdischer Tradition. FS J. Maier. BBB* 88 (1993), 97-120; P. J. Budd, "Priestly Instruction in Pre-Exilic Israel," *VT* 23 (1973) 1-14; H. Cazelles, "Le Pentateuque comme Torah," *Autour de l'Exode* (Paris, 1987), 9-53 (repr. from M. Tardieu, ed., *Les règles de l'interprétation* [Paris, 1987], 35-68); idem, "Torah et Loi," *Autour de l'Exode*, 131-41 (repr. from G. Nahon and C. Touati, eds., *Études d'histoire et de pensée juives* [Louvain-la-Neuve, 1980], 1-12); D. J. A. Clines, "The Tree of Knowledge and the Law of Yahweh (Psalm XIX)," *VT* 24 (1974) 8-14; A. Cody, *History of OT Priesthood. AnBibl* 35 (1969), 108-24, esp. 116 n. 22; H. H. Cohn, "The Secularization of Divine Law," in idem, ed., *Jewish Law in Ancient and Modern Israel* (New York, 1971), 1-49; B. Couroyer, "*'édût:* stipulation de traité ou enseignement," *RB* 95 (1988) 321-31; F. Crüsemann, "Der Pentateuch als Tora," *EvT* 49 (1989) 250-67; idem, *The Torah* (Eng. tr. Minneapolis, 1996); W. D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. JBLMS* 7 (1952), 13-38; A. Deissler, *Psalm 119 (118) und seine Theologie. MTS* 1/11 (1955); C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935), esp. 25-41; M. Fishbane, "Psalm 19/Creation, Torah and Hope," *Text and Texture* (New York, 1979), 84-90; idem, "Torah and Tradition," in D. A. Knight, ed., *Tradition and Theology in the OT* (Philadelphia, 1977), 275-300; F. Foresti, "Il Deuteronomio," in A. Fanuli, ed., *Sapienza e Torah. Atti della XXIX Settimana Biblica* (Bologna, 1987), 17-30; A. Gampert, *La Thora* (Geneva, 1895); F. García López, "Dalla Torah al Pentateuco," *Ricerche Storico Bibliche* 3/1 (Bologna, 1991) 11-26; M. Gilbert, "La place de la loi dans la prière de Néhémie 9," in M. Carrez et al., eds., *De la Torah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles* (Paris, 1981), 307-16; P. R. Gilchrist, "Towards a Covenantal Definition of tôrâ," in R. L. Harris et al., eds., *Interpretation and History. FS A. A. Macrae* (Singapore, 1986), 93-107; J. Goldstain, *Les valeurs de la loi* (Paris, 1980); E. L. Greenstein, "The Torah as She Is Read," *Response* 47 (1985) 17-40;

S. Greidanus, "The Universal Dimension of Law in the Hebrew Scriptures," *SR* 14 (1985) 39-51; H. Gross, "Thora und Gnade im AT," *Kairos* 14 (1972) 220-31; W. Gutbrod, "νόμος B: The Law in the OT," *TDNT*, IV, 1036-47; R. Hentschke, *Satzung und Setzender. BWANT* 83 (1963); M. V. Houston, "The Identification of Torah as Wisdom" (diss., Iowa, 1987); C. Houtman, "Ezra and the Law," *OTS* 21 (1981) 91-115; J. P. Hyatt, "Torah in the Book of Jeremiah," *JBL* 60 (1941) 381-96; J. Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah. CBQMS* 3 (1973); M. D. Johnson, "The Paralysis of Torah in Habakkuk I 4," *VT* 35 (1985) 257-66; U. Kellermann, "Anmerkungen zum Verständnis der Tora in den chronistischen Schriften," *BN* 42 (1988) 49-92; K. Koch, "Gesetz I. AT," *TRE*, XVII, 40-52; M. Köckert, "Leben in Gottes Gegenwart," *JBT* 4 (1989) 29-61; idem, "Das nahe Wort," *TP* 60 (1985) 496-519; H.-J. Kraus, "Das Telos der Torah," *JBT* 3 (1988) 55-82; idem, "Zum Gesetzesverständnis der nachprophetischen Zeit," *Kairos* 11 (1969) 55-82; E. Kutsch, "Menschliche Weisung — Gesetz Gottes," in S. Heine and E. Heintel, eds., *Gott ohne Eigenschaften?* (Vienna, 1983), 77-106; T. Lescow, "Die dreistufige Tora," *ZAW* 83 (1970) 362-79; J. D. Levenson, "The Sources of Torah," in P. D. Miller et al., eds., *Ancient Israelite Religion. FS F. M. Cross* (Philadelphia, 1987), 559-74; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971); idem and C. Petersen, "תּוֹרָה *tôrâ* instruction," *TLOT*, III, 1415-22; J. N. Lighthouse, "Torah Is *nomos* — Except When It Is Not," *SR* 13 (1984) 29-37; M. Limbeck, *Die Ordnung des Heils* (Düsseldorf, 1971); B. Lindars, "Torah in Deuteronomy," in P. Ackroyd and B. Lindars, eds., *Words and Meanings. FS D. Winton Thomas* (Cambridge, 1968), 117-36; N. Lohfink, "Kennt das AT einen Unterschied von 'Gebot' und 'Gesetz'?" *JBT* 4 (1989) 63-89; O. Loretz, "Die *twrh*-Stellen in Jes I," *UF* 8 (1976) 450-51; J. R. Lundbom, "The Lawbook of the Josianic Reform," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 293-302; J. Malfroy, "Sagesse et loi dans le Deutéronome," *VT* 15 (1965) 49-65; R. Martin-Achard, "Brèves remarques sur la signification théologique de la loi selon l'AT," *ETR* 57 (1982) 343-59; D. J. McCarthy, "Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah," *CBQ* 44 (1982) 25-44; W. O. McCready, "A Second Torah at Qumran," *SR* 14 (1985) 5-15; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men. SBT* 1/44 (1965), 102-12; J. L. Mays, "The Place of the Torah-Psalms in the Psalter," *JBL* 106 (1987) 3-12; E. M. Meyers, "The Use of *tôrâ* in Haggai 2:11 and the Role of the Prophet in the Restoration Community," in C. L. Meyers and M. P. O'Connor, eds., *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. FS D. N. Freedman* (Winona Lake, 1983), 69-76; L. Monsengwo Pasinya, *La notion de* nomos *dans le Pentateuque grec. AnBibl* 52 (1973); R. E. Murphy, "A Study of the Hebrew Root *yrh*" (diss., Catholic University of America, 1948); J. M. Myers, *Grace and Torah* (Philadelphia, 1975); J. Neusner, *Torah* (Philadelphia, 1986); E. Nielsen, "Moses and the Law," *VT* 32 (1982) 87-98; G. Östborn, *Tora in the OT* (Lund, 1945); A. Paul, "La torah et la canon chrétien," *RSR* 71 (1983) 139-47; L. Perlitt, "'Evangelium' und Gesetz im Deuteronomium," in T. Veijola, ed., *The Law in the Bible and in Its Environment. PFES* 51 (1990), 23-38; B. de Pinto, "The Torah and the Psalms," *JBL* 86 (1967) 154-74; H. Räisänen, *The Torah and Christ* (Helsinki, 1986); R. Rendtorff, "Esra und das Gesetz," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 165-84; A. Renker, *Die Tora bei Maleachi. FThSt* 112 (1978); A. Robert, "Le sens du mot loi dans le Ps. CXIX (Vulg. CXVIII)," *RB* 46 (1937) 182-206; H. Robscheit, "Die Thora bei Amos und Hosea," *EvT* 10 (1950/51) 26-38; J. A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia, 1972); N. Sarna, "Psalm XIX and the Near Eastern Sun-God Literature," *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, I (Jerusalem, 1967), 171-75; W. H. Schmidt, "Werk Gottes und Tun des Menschen," *JBT* 4 (1989) 11-28; H. Seebass, "The Relationship of Torah and Promise in the Redactionary Composition of the Pentateuch," *HBT* 7/1 (1985) 99-122; A. F. Segal, "Torah and *nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion," *SR* 13 (1984) 19-27; T. Seidl, *Tora für den "Aussatz"-Fall. ATS* 18 (1982); R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Freiburg im Breisgau, [2]1899); L. P. Smith, "The Use of the Word תורה in Isaiah, Chapters 1–39," *AJSL* 46 (1929/30) 1-21; W. Soll, *Psalm 119. CBQMS* 23 (1991); H. Stegemann, "The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll," in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem, 1992), 156-85; idem, "Die 'Mitte der Schrift' aus der Sicht der Gemeinde von Qumran," in M. Klopfenstein et al., eds., *Mitte der*

I. Etymology. The etymology of *tôrâ* has been much debated in the course of OT scholarship, but to no satisfactory conclusion. The proposed etymologies can be summarized under three headings.[1]

For Gesenius *tôrâ* derives from the vb. *yrh,* "throw, hurl."[2] The semantic development is from "throw" to "stretch out a finger or hand, point in a direction," and finally to "show the way."[3]

According to Wellhausen, *tôrâ* derives from the hiphil of the vb. *yrh,* which has the basic meaning "throw." He connects the hiphil *hôrâ* with the act of "interpreting the future" (cf. Josh. 18:6), associated with the sacred ministry of the priests, who are charged with casting the *'ûrîm* and *tummîm* (Ex. 28:30; Dt. 33:8). In this view *tôrâ* is an answer from God obtained through the process of interpreting the future.[4]

Finally, Delitzsch claims that *tôrâ* derives from Akk. *têrtu,* from *(w)aru* (Heb. *yrh*), "bring, lead, lead away" (I) or "send, transmit (esp. the knowledge and practice of something), instruct."[5]

Cazelles says: "That in West Semitic *tôrâ* referred originally not to instruction but to an oracle or divine decision has now been demonstrated by the discoveries at Mari, which clarify certain scattered observations of Assyriologists. A vb. *wâru* corresponds to Heb. *yrh/wrh* (?), just as its derivative *têret* corresponds to *tôrâ.* Now we can finally distinguish this root from *yrh,* 'throw,' which becomes *w'r* as analyzed by Bottéro and Finet. *wâru* does not mean 'teach' but 'give orders, instructions,' or 'send a message/messenger.' As regards *têrtu(m)* (const. *têret*), . . . it may be rendered . . . 'omen' or 'oracle.'"[6]

These proposals make clear that it will not be easy to understand the meanings of the term *tôrâ* on the basis of its etymology. Gutbrod[7] made the same observation years ago, and it has been repeated more recently by Jensen.[8] It is therefore essential to follow the actual text of the Hebrew Bible in order to ascertain the semantic spectrum of *tôrâ.* It must be emphasized, however, that the majority of present-day exegetes translate *tôrâ* as "instruction, education, teaching," though not ruling out other contextual meanings or nuances.

Schrift? (Bern, 1987), 149-84; G. Wallis, "Torah und Nomos," *TLZ* 105 (1980) 321-32; J. Weingreen, "Oral Torah and Written Records," in F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp, eds., *Holy Book and Holy Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 1968), 54-67; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Eng. tr. Cleveland, 1957), 391-409; S. Westerholm, "*Torah, nomos* and Law," *SR* 15 (1986) 327-36; T. Willi, "Thora in den biblischen Chronikbüchern," *Jud* 36 (1980) 102-5, 148-51; R. B. Zuck, "Hebrew Words for 'Teach,'" *BSac* 121 (1964) 228-35.

1. For a detailed history see Östborn, 4-22.

2. *GesTh,* II (1835), 626-27.

3. Cf. Gampert, 15.

4. Wellhausen, 394-95; idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin, 1887), 127; Smend, 41-42 n. 3.

5. F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1886), 41 n. 47; idem, *Assyrische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1889), 149.

6. "Torah et Loi," 136-37.

7. P. 1045.

8. P. 5.

rences with a suffix, 17 are in P, 9 in DtrH, 19 in ChrH, 10 in the prophets, 5 in the Psalms, 4 in Proverbs, and 2 in Daniel. This form is clearly typical of P and ChrH. Once again, its total absence from Deuteronomy is striking. The word occurs 17 times with the 1st person singular suffix *(tôrāṯî);* 7 of these are in Jeremiah. It occurs 31 times with the 2d person singular suffix *(tôrāṯᵉḵā);* 25 of these are in the Psalms. Finally, it occurs 5 times with the 3d person singular suffix *(tôrāṯô)* (twice each in Isaiah and Psalms, once in Jeremiah).

In contrast to the usage of the absolute, it is striking that two-thirds (77) of the construct phrases with *tôrâ* refer to God: *tôraṯ yhwh* 19 times (10 in Chronicles), *tôraṯ ʼᵉlōhîm* 8 times (4 in Chronicles), *tôrāṯî (yhwh)* 15 times (11 in the prophets), *tôrāṯᵉḵā (yhwh)* 30 times (24 in the Psalms), *tôrāṯᵉḵā (ʼᵉlōhîm)* once (Ps. 40:9[Eng. 8]), and *tôrāṯô* 4 times (twice in the Psalms).

Also of note are the references to Moses in the formula *tôraṯ-mōšeh,* which occurs 14 times (6 times in DtrH, 5 times in ChrH, twice in Daniel, and once in Malachi). The formula *tôraṯ*-x can also refer to a mother (*tôraṯ ʼēm,* Prov. 1:8; 6:20), a sage (*tôraṯ hāḵām,* Prov. 3:1; 4:2; 13:14), the psalmist (Ps. 78:1), or humanity in general (*tôraṯ hāʼāḏām,* 2 S. 7:19, although the text of this passage is highly disputed[10]). In the Priestly tradition the expression *(wᵉ)zōʼṯ tôraṯ*-x is a characteristic formula used to introduce a specific law of the cultic community.[11] The teaching and application of these laws are among the specific functions of the priesthood.

The lexeme *tôrâ* occurs only 12 times in the plural in the MT, 8 times with a suffix and 4 without. In Gen. 26:5; Ex. 16:28; Ezk. 44:24, *tôrōṯay* refers to Yahweh; the same is true of *tôrōṯāyw* in Ex. 18:16; Ps. 105:45; Dnl. 9:10. The pl. *tôrôṯ* in Lev. 26:46 and Ezk. 44:5*(Q)*,24 denotes the whole body of individual laws governing the cultic community.

3. *Verbs.* The noun *tôrâ* is constructed with a wide range of verbs, which fall into two basic categories. The first comprises verbs that interpret or convey (orally or in writing) a teaching, a dialogue, or a tradition: *bʼr* (Dt. 1:5), *byn* (Neh. 8:7), *zhr* (Ex. 18:20), *ḥtm* (Isa. 8:16), *ydʻ* (Ex. 18:20), *yrh* (Dt. 17:11; 33:10), *ktb* (Ex. 24:12; Dt. 17:18; 27:3,8; etc.), *mwš* (Josh. 1:8), *ntn* (Ex. 24:12; Lev. 26:46; Dt. 4:8; 31:9; Jer. 9:12; 31:33; Ezr. 7:6; etc.), *ṣwh* (Nu. 19:2; 31:21; Dt. 33:4; Josh. 1:17; etc.), *qrʼ* (Dt. 31:11; Josh. 8:34; Neh. 8:8,18; etc.), *śym* (Dt. 4:44; 31:26; Ps. 78:5; etc.). Responsibility for imparting, communicating, or teaching *tôrâ* generally fell to the priests, prophets, and sages. Often the action is initiated by a request or petition, as in Hag. 2:11: "Ask *(šʼl)* the priests for a ruling *(tôrâ)* on the following question."

The second category comprises verbs that express responses and reactions, positive or negative, to *tôrâ: ʼhb* (Ps. 119:97,133,163,165), *ʼzn* (Isa. 1:10; Ps. 78:1), *drš* (Ezr. 7:10), *hgh* (Ps. 1:2b), *ḥzq* (2 Ch. 31:4), *ḥms* (Ezk. 22:26), *zkr* (Mal. 3:22), *hlk* (Ex. 16:4; 2 K. 10:31; Jer. 26:4; 32:23; 44:10,23; Ps. 78:10; 119:1; Dnl. 9:10; Neh. 10:30;

10. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* (1984), 233.

11. See III.2 below.

2 Ch. 6:16), *lmd* (Ps. 94:12), *lqḥ* (Dt. 31:26; Job 22:22), *m's* (Isa. 5:24; Jer. 6:19; Am. 2:4), *mwš* (Josh. 1:8), *nṭš* (Prov. 1:8; 6:20), *nṣr* (Ps. 105:45; 119:34; Prov. 28:7), *'br* (Isa. 24:5; Dnl. 9:11a), *'zb* (Jer. 9:12[13]; Ps. 89:31[30]; 119:53; Prov. 4:2; 28:4a; 2 Ch. 12:1), *'śh* (Dt. 17:19; 27:26; 28:58; 29:28[29]; 31:12; 32:46; 2 K. 17:34; Ezr. 10:3; Neh. 9:34; 2 Ch. 14:3), *pš'* (Hos. 8:1), *rḥq* (Ps. 119:150), *śkl* (Neh. 8:13), *šwb* (Neh. 9:29; cf. 2 K. 23:25), *škḥ* (Hos. 4:6; Ps. 119:61,109,153; Prov. 3:1), *šlk* (Neh. 9:26), *šm'* (Isa. 30:9; 42:24; Ezk. 44:5; Zec. 7:12; Prov. 28:9; Neh. 8:9; 13:13; 2 Ch. 34:19), *šmr* (Gen. 26:5; Ex. 16:28; Dt. 17:19; 30:10; 2 K. 17:13; Jer. 16:11; Ezk. 44:24; Ps. 119:34,44,55,136; Prov. 28:4b; 29:18; 1 Ch. 22:12), *šmr l'śwt* (Dt. 28:58; 31:12; 32:46; Josh. 1:7; 22:5; 23:6; 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 17:37), and *šmr llkt* (2 K. 10:31; Jer. 26:4; 2 Ch. 6:16).

The commonest verbs in the first category are *ktb, ṣwh,* and *ntn;* the commonest in the second category are *šmr, hlk,* and *'śh.* The use of the tenses exhibits great variety. Sometimes the perfect is used to express an existing reality: "Because they have forsaken [*'zḇm;* inf.] my instructions" (Jer. 9:12[13]); "because they transgress *('brw)* my law" (Hos. 8:1). At other times the text uses an imperfect or its equivalent to encourage or enforce a particular response to *tôrâ:* "Listen to *(h'zynw)* the teaching *(tôrâ)* of our God" (Isa. 1:10); "My child, do not forget *('l-tškḥ)* my teaching *(tôrâ)*" (Prov. 3:1). Other texts are less concerned to present personal responses to *tôrâ* than to describe the situation in which they take place: "The *tôrâ* has no force" (Hab. 1:4).

4. *Parallelisms.* Synonyms used in parallel with a term not only define its semantic field but also illuminate its meaning. As already noted, *tôrâ* means "instruction" or "teaching," handed down either orally or in writing. When this tradition is authoritative and binding, *tôrâ* can take on the character of a law. As a consequence, the most important parallels to *tôrâ* belong to the semantic field of instruction and the law, especially *mišpāṭ(îm), ḥōq (ḥuqqîm)/ḥuqqâ (ḥuqqôṯ), miṣwâ (miṣwôṯ), b^{e}rîṯ, 'ēḏûṯ, dereḵ, dāḇār (d^{e}ḇārîm), '^{a}mārîm, piqqûḏîm, mišmereṯ, mûsār + ḥoḵmâ,* and *ḥāzôn.*

In the Pentateuch the first three *(mišpāṭ, ḥōq, miṣwâ)* appear in legal contexts in parallel with *tôrâ.* In DtrH we also find *b^{e}rîṯ, 'ēḏûṯ, dereḵ, dāḇār,* and *mišmereṯ.* Complete lists appear in Josh. 24:25-26; 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 17:34,37. This usage changes little if at all in ChrH, an observation that is quite natural if we recall that the Chronicler was inspired by this sphere. In addition to these terms, the Psalms use *'^{a}mārîm* and *piqqûḏîm.* In the prophets, especially the earlier prophets (Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah), *dāḇār (d^{e}ḇārîm)* is the commonest parallel, in contrast to Ezekiel, Malachi, and Habakkuk. In addition, wisdom literature, more specifically Proverbs, uses *miṣwâ* (the most frequent parallel), as well as *'^{a}mārîm* and *dāḇār (d^{e}ḇārîm),* together with *mûsār* and *ḥoḵmâ.* Finally, we find *ḥāzôn* in Lam. 2:9 (cf. Ezk. 7:26) and *t^e'ûḏâ* in Isa. 8:16,20.

5. *Types.* Östborn's semantic studies of *tôrâ* in the OT distinguish five groups who are authorized to give *tôrâ:* the Deity, the king, priests, sages, and prophets. As mentioned above, there were also persons associated with the king who were concerned with *tôrâ.* On the other hand, it has been noted that "God does not give תורה except

thus lies on the same plane as the *tôrôṯ*[18] (contra Knierim, who claims that the *tôrâ* of Moses to the people has nothing to do with legal material). Schäfer-Lichtenberger has recently defended the very early date and legal importance of this text: "Ex. 18:13ff. knows the etiological legend justifying this legal structure, which was initiated early on in David's rule of Israel and Judah."[19]

2. *P and Ezekiel.* a. The noun *tôrâ* occurs 27 times in the Priestly traditions of the Tetrateuch (once in Exodus, 16 times in Leviticus, 10 times in Numbers), generally in the later strata. The term never appears in P^G and only once in H (Lev. 26:46 — the only text in the Priestly tradition that uses the plural of *tôrâ*).

The noun is an essential element of several more or less fixed and stereotyped formulas that are characteristic of these traditions. The closest parallels are in the book of Ezekiel. The most frequent formula consists of the expression *(wᵉ)zōʾṯ tôraṯ + nomen rectum,* the latter naming the theme. Sometimes this formula appears in superscriptions or introductions (Lev. 6:2,7,18[9,14,25]; 7:1,11; Nu. 6:13), sometimes concluding formulas (Lev. 11:46; 12:7; 13:59; 14:32,57b; 15:32; Nu. 5:29; 6:21a). Among these texts Nu. 6:13-21 stands out: its beginning and conclusion form an *inclusio* using the formula *(wᵉ)zōʾṯ tôraṯ hannāzîr.*

A similar but slightly different formula is *zōʾṯ hattôrâ (lᵉ);* it too is used as both an introductory (Nu. 19:14) and a concluding formula (Lev. 7:37; 14:54). The same formula but in reverse order *(hattôrâ hazzōʾṯ)* appears in Nu. 5:30, the only text in the Priestly tradition that uses this stylistic device, which usually appears in the Dtn/Dtr tradition. Four texts (Ex. 12:49; Lev. 7:7; Nu. 15:16,29) use the expression *tôrâ ʾaḥaṯ.*

Except for Lev. 7:7, all other texts use the vb. *hāyâ,* although in a different position than in 14:2. In 14:2 the formula *zōʾṯ tôraṯ* is interrupted by the interpolated vb. *hāyâ (zōʾṯ tihyeh tôraṯ),* and in Nu. 6:21 the qualification *(haz)zōʾṯ* is omitted. In reality v. 21b repeats the substance of v. 21a.[20] Finally, Nu. 19:2 and 31:21 use the expression *zōʾṯ ḥuqqaṯ hattôrâ,* which is pleonastic, since *ḥuqqâ* and *tôrâ* are synonymous in P and have developed in the same setting.

Even though the formulas vary, the semantic spectrum of *tôrâ* in the texts of P^G remains focused on cultic legislation; the term refers to God's instructions for the ritual ministry of the priests. They take the form of ritual precepts governing such matters as sacrifice (Lev. 6–7), the purification of women (12:7), leprosy (chs. 13–14), and the purification of males after an emission of semen (15:32).

Finally, the expression *tôrâ ʾaḥaṯ* emphasizes the universal validity of a *tôrâ.* In the same way the parallel expression *ḥuqqaṯ ʿôlām* serves to emphasize the eternal value of the law. The combination of the two synonyms *ḥuqqâ* and *tôrâ* in the pleonastic expression *zōʾṯ ḥuqqaṯ hattôrâ* in Nu. 19:2 and 31:21 is typical of the Priestly textual tradition from Ex. 12 to Nu. 31; it is intended to underline the uniform and eternal force of

18. R. Knierim, *ZAW* 73 (1961) 146-71; but cf. G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the OT* (1925, repr. New York, 1971), 204-6.

19. C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *DBAT* 21 (1985) 84.

20. See above.

clean and unclean, and make the appropriate rulings. Here he also has a didactic function, which must not be limited simply to cultic casuistry.

Hos. 4:6 and Jer. 2:8 show that the competence of the priesthood extended beyond purely cultic questions (Dt. 17:8-11). In difficult legal cases the Levitical priests are to be consulted as the place chosen by Yahweh, so that they may issue a *tôrâ* (v. 11). The procedure clearly corresponds to that followed by Moses (Ex. 18:15ff.); their role is also legitimated by the emphasis on the common origin of Moses and the Levites.[22] Furthermore, Moses' sphere of activity is by no means limited to judicial and priestly functions; it includes charismatic and prophetic elements. Dt. 17:9-12 and 19:17 speak of priests and judges together. Their function in such cases consists in the issuing of *tôrôṯ*, decisions in God's name.

Dt. 33:10 foretells that the Levitical priests will teach Israel their *tôrôṯ: yôrû lᵉyaʿqōḇ mišpāṭeyḵā wᵉṯôrāṯᵉḵā lᵉyiśrā'ēl.* Begrich[23] and Gressmann[24] suggest the reading *tôrōṯᵉḵā* (pl. instead of sg.); so understood, Dt. 33:10 would fit better with Ex. 18:16, which also uses the pl. *tôrôṯ*. Dt. 33:8-11 is the locus classicus for priestly *tôrâ*. Very likely this function (at least at the outset) included oracular techniques of determining God's will, as Ex. 18:13-23 suggests.[25] The parallelism of *tôrāṯᵉḵā* and *mišpāṭeyḵā* might indicate that the teachings of the priests extended to include the legal realm. This holds true for the promulgation of a *têrtu* in Babylonia, which could have the force of a judicial decree.[26]

b. The textual corpus of Deuteronomy through Kings includes the most important statements concerning *tôrâ* in the OT, not only because of the frequent appearance of the term, but above all because this section coins several new expressions such as *sēp̄er/diḇrê hattôrâ,* the nuances of which will be examined in the following discussion.

The usage of the term *tôrâ* in the complex Deuteronomy–Kings corresponds in large measure to usage in the other books of the OT. With the exception of Dt. 33:4,10, which is not really representative of the Dtn tradition, Deuteronomy never associates *tôrâ* directly with Yahweh or Moses, whereas this association is relatively common in Joshua–Kings. In Deuteronomy, as in Joshua–Kings, *tôrâ* appears as an independent term; a different usage is found in Josh. 22:5 and 2 K. 17:34,37, where *tôrâ* appears in a series of legal terms. Except in Dt. 17:11 and 34:4,10, *tôrâ* in Deuteronomy appears in three fixed expressions. Although there is much stereotyped vocabulary in Joshua–Kings, the integration of *tôrâ* into stock phrases is less common there. These include *sēp̄er hattôrâ* (4 times in Deuteronomy, 8 in Joshua–Kings) and *diḇrê hattôrâ* (9 in Deuteronomy, 3 in Joshua–Kings). Both expressions make their first appearance in the MT here and do not reappear until ChrH.

The phrase *sēp̄er hattôrâ* appears basically in four forms: (1) by itself (Josh. 8:34;

---

22. C. Hauret, *Bibl* 40 (1959) 516-19.
23. P. 233 n. 10.
24. H. Gressmann, *Anfänge Israels* (Göttingen, ²1922), 175 n. 5.
25. Lindars, 120.
26. Östborn, 48-51; see I above.

iah and Hosea do these appear in authentic texts of the prophet. The occurrence of *tôrâ* in Mic. 4:2 has been the subject of much dispute, and Am. 2:4 is generally considered Dtr.

(1) Of the 7 occurrences of *tôrâ* in Proto-Isaiah, Isa. 24:5 is late postexilic, and 5:24 is the work of a redactor inspired by Isaiah.[35] Isa. 8:20, too, is generally considered secondary. The authenticity of 2:3 is debated, as is true of Mic. 4:2. Accordingly, only 1:10; 8:16; 30:9 may be considered authentically Isaianic — clearly not much evidence, but very indicative and significant for an understanding of *tôrâ* in the case of this prophet.

Isa. 1:10 is the first text to used the term *tôrâ* in synonymous parallelism with *d*ᵉ*ḇar yhwh* (see also Isa. 2:3; Jer. 6:19; 18:18; 26:4-5; Mic. 4:2; Zec. 7:12). This parallelism is not found outside prophetic literature, an observation that supports its distinctively prophetic character.

Isa. 1:10 is a "summons to receive instruction,"[36] introducing the unit 1:10-17. This section associates *d*ᵉ*ḇar yhwh, tôrâ,* and the cult. Here *tôrâ* has its original meaning of specific instruction addressing a particular situation, not a general teaching. The parallelism of *tôrâ* and *d*ᵉ*ḇar yhwh* subsumes cultic and sapiential elements,[37] the observance of which the prophet demands.

Isa. 8:16 and 30:9 appeal to written instruction (cf. 30:8, which is the basis for v. 9). In 8:16 Isaiah is ordered to sign his *tôrâ,* the normal practice with an official document. Even though the language of this verse is symbolic and hard to interpret, we cannot rule out a concrete reference: at the end of his prophetic ministry Isaiah is to put his message in writing. Here the context shows that *tôrâ* is synonymous with *t*ᵉʿ*ûḏâ,* i.e., an oracle or series of oracles of the prophet.

The expression *b*ᵉ*limmuḏāy* underlines the sapiential or didactic aspect of the text. In such contexts *tôrâ* means "instruction," the precise substance of which remains open to discussion. Therefore the context should be expanded to include at least the immediately preceding oracle (Isa. 8:12-15), which describes Isaiah's attitude toward the Syro-Ephraimite War, and possibly the whole corpus of oracles on this subject (7:1–8:15). No matter what the scope of this document is, we may have here the earliest nucleus around which the Isaianic material crystallized.[38] The Isaianic tradition would thus go back to a text (or better two texts, if we include 30:8-9) written by the prophet in person. Such texts later came to have the value of a formal document: "In 8:16 we have the initial germ of the process that led ultimately to the development of the canon."[39] Finally, this text *(t*ᵉʿ*ûḏâ)* is called *tôrâ* because it contains a teaching or instruction from Yahweh.[40]

The Hosea texts are the first to embody a clear idea of priestly *tôrâ.* Hos. 4:6 takes a

35. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 212.
36. Ibid., 37.
37. Jensen, 68-84.
38. Von Rad, *OT Theology,* II, 41.
39. B. Duhm, *Jesaia. HKAT* III/1 (⁵1968), 85.
40. Jensen, 110-12.

are clearly secondary. In Isa. 5:24 and Am. 2:4 *tôrat̠ yhwh* is the object of *mā'as;* in Isa. 24:5 and Am. 2:4 *ḥōq* and *tôrâ* are parallel. These features fit with texts that are considered Dtr. Indeed, the expression *mā'as tôrat̠ yhwh* has its closest parallels in the Dtr texts 1 S. 8:7; 10:19; 15:23,26; 2 K. 17:15; Jer. 6:19 (cf. Lev. 26:15,43-44; Ezk. 5:6; 20:24). The use of *ḥōq* and *tôrâ* in parallel may be considered typically Dtr (cf. Dt. 17:19; 2 K. 17:37). These observations together with other evidence — theological, linguistic, and conceptual — have led to the suggestion that Am. 2:4b is Dtr.[46] For DtrH the *tôrâ* of Yahweh is the measure by which the conduct of the people is judged. Israel's sin consists in having rejected the *tôrâ.* In Am. 2:4b the statement that Israel has rejected the *tôrat̠ yhwh* has the nature of a generalization, especially when compared with the much more concrete grounds of the authentic oracles against the nations in Am. 1–2.

In Isa. 5:18-23 the transgressions listed in the woes are summarized by the statement: "They have rejected the instruction of the Lord" (v. 24b). But this statement may have been inserted by a Dtr redactor (like Am. 2:4b). In both texts *tôrâ* refers to the law. It has the same meaning in Isa. 24:5, where *tôrâ* not only parallels *ḥōq* but also appears in the context of the Sinai covenant, in which the parties are obligated to observe the laws *(tôrôt̠).* Schmidt even asks whether the *tôrâ* that Judah rejects may not be the Dtn law.[47] This is a reasonable question, since for the Dtr redactor *tôrat̠ mōšeh* and *tôrat̠ yhwh* are synonymous with Proto-Deuteronomy.

Isa. 8:20 is not Dtr in origin, but was probably added during the exile, i.e., in the period of the Dtr redactors.[48] Vv. 19-20 are a commentary on v. 16, contrasting the true word of God, which is proclaimed by the prophet, with the word of those who believe in necromancy and divination. In Dt. 18:9-14,15-22, the situation is similar. Here too abhorrent false prophecy is contrasted with the true word of God. On the basis of this evidence, we may conclude that the author of Isa. 8:20 is sympathetic to the Dtr tradition. The language is not metaphorical, for *tôrâ* is no longer a collection of oracle interpretations but a comprehensive and fundamental prophetic legacy.

b. The word *tôrâ* is used by three of the four 7th-century prophets, appearing 11 times in Jeremiah and once each in Zephaniah and Habakkuk. It is not found in Nahum. Only 3 texts in Jeremiah may be considered authentic: 2:8; 8:8; 18:18. The others are typical of Dtr redaction.

(1) Jer. 2:8; 8:8; 18:18 possess common features; at the same time they have points of contact with Zeph. 3:4 and Hab. 1:4. The setting of the three Jeremiah texts is the conflict between the prophet and the other leaders, institutions, and social structures of society or the nation. His most important opponents are the priests, false prophets, and sages. Zeph. 3:4 also attacks the priests and prophets. If Jer. 8:7 and 8:8 belong to the same unit,[49] then *tôrat̠ yhwh* would parallel *mišpāṭ,* as in Hab. 1:4. The language of these Jeremiah texts is

---

46. W. H. Schmidt, *ZAW* 77 (1965) 177-78; H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 151-52, 163-64.

47. W. H. Schmidt, *ZAW* 77 (1965) 177; cf. J. L. Mays, *Amos. OTL* (1969), 41-42.

48. R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39. NCBC* (1980), 101-2.

49. W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 275-76, 281-82.

Jehoiakim refused to follow up his father's reforms.[54] In this context *tôrâ* has a juristic and executive aspect, referring to a decision that may be either priestly or civil. We must remember, however, that in this period the administration of justice was still in the hands of the priests (Dt. 17:8-13).[55]

(2) Jer. 6:19; 9:12(13); 16:11; 26:4; 32:23; 44:10,23 clearly exhibit Dtr terminology and theology. In these texts *tôrâ* appears with a suffix referring to Yahweh; it is the object of verbs that describe negative conduct on the part of the people: *mā'as* (6:19), *'āzaḇ* (9:12[13]; cf. 16:11), *lō' šāmar* (16:11), *lō' hālaḵ* (26:4; 32:23; 44:10,23; cf. 9:12[13]). The Dtr author is attempting to provide a theological explanation for the fall of Jerusalem: the disaster was brought about by Israel's idolatry, by its forsaking of Yahweh and disregard for the law. In this context *tôrâ* has the sense of a law: the law of God spoken by the prophets (26:4). In 44:2-10 past history (vv. 3-6) is contrasted with the present day (vv. 7-10), the generation of Israel's ancestors with the present generation.

Jer. 31:33 is post-Dtr. The passage contrasts the *tôrâ* presently in force, understood as an outward, physical document, with the new law that God will put within the people, writing it on their hearts. It will establish a new relationship between God and his people, making possible a new knowledge of and intimacy with God. This is a new covenant, which is incomprehensible without the new *tôrâ:* "This time, the new covenant is understood entirely as presupposing the Torah. ברית and תורה are virtually coincident. Therefore the aim of the promise is not to *restore* the broken relationship with God but to *complete* the relationship with God made possible by the Torah."[56] The expression "my *tôrâ*" refers not just to a particular instruction given by God but to the declaration of Yahweh's will, set down in writing.

The inward *tôrâ* in the human heart appears also in Isa. 51:7, a text that employs terminology similar to that of Jer. 31:33: "Listen to me, you who know righteousness, you people who have my law in your hearts *('ām tôrāṯî ḇᵉlibbām)*." This passage is referring to the "righteous" within the community of Israel, who remained true to the *tôrâ.*

These passages in the prophets, like others in certain Psalms (Ps. 1:2; 37:31; 40:9[8]; 119), already bear witness to a kind of *tôrâ* piety. From this perspective the *tôrâ* or law is the way of salvation generally, not simply in a juristic sense.

c. In the exilic and postexilic prophets (apart from Ezekiel[57]), *tôrâ* occurs 12 times: 5 times in Deutero-Isaiah, once each in Haggai and Zechariah, and 5 times in Malachi. Although the term is uncommon in these textual complexes, it possesses a diversified semantic spectrum. Hag. 2:11 and Mal. 2:6-9 are concerned with priestly *tôrâ,* while Zec. 7:12 has more to do with *tôrâ* of the prophetic type. Deutero-Isaiah fluctuates between both forms.[58]

(1) In the texts in Deutero-Isaiah our attention is caught immediately by the parallel-

54. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 202.

55. See III.3.a above.

56. C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des Neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 264.

57. See III.2 above.

58. J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah. AB* (1968), 36-38, 46.

law and the prophets, appear in the same context. The title *'eḇeḏ* given to Moses in 3:22(4:4) appears at the end of the Pentateuch (Dt. 34:5) and at the beginning of DtrH (Josh. 1:2), where Yahweh also commands Joshua to be careful "to act in accordance with all the instruction *(tôrâ)* that my servant Moses gave you" (v. 7). Rudolph concludes that Mal. 3:22(4:4) is not simply an addition to Malachi and the Minor Prophets, but belongs to the Former and Latter Prophets as a whole.[64]

Although the situation is not immediately clear from the outset, the semantic spectrum of *tôrâ* in Zec. 7:12 and Mal. 3:22(4:4) is quite congruent with Dtn/Dtr usage: *tôrâ* does indeed stand for the law, but ultimately for the totality of divine revelation. Other similarities between Deuteronomy and Mal. 3:22(4:4) appear in the use of the following terms: *zāḵar, ḥāraḇ, ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm, 'eḇeḏ, ṣiwwâ*. In the opinion of Lindars,[65] Zec. 7:12 and Mal. 3:22(4:4) constitute a bridge between Deuteronomy and ChrH, in which *tôrâ* has the meaning of "law as a whole."[66] For the semantic development of *tôrâ* in the prophetic books, we may conclude that *tôrâ* comes to stand for a category of authoritative revelation: "the law and the prophets."

5. *Psalms*. a. Of the 36 occurrences of *tôrâ* in the Psalms, 26 are in Ps. 119, which, like Ps. 1 and 19, is called a *tôrâ* psalm. This designation accurately reflects not only their literary genre but also their content. The term *tôrâ* and a series of synonyms are the nucleus around which these psalms have crystallized.

Many scholars consider Ps. 1 to be a kind of introduction or preamble to the book of Psalms as a whole. Some believe that Ps. 119 may originally have represented the conclusion of the book of Psalms.[67] Such an assumption might justify calling the book of Psalms a "psalmic *tôrâ*." Even though this theory must remain hypothetical, it is noteworthy that the book of Psalms begins with a *tôrâ* psalm, a macarism praising those who base their entire lives on the *tôrâ*. "Presumably the compiler of the Psalter deliberately assigned first place to this psalm in order to call the reader to obedience to God's will and to trust in his providential rule."[68]

There is some ambiguity in the semantic spectrum of *tôrâ* in the Psalms. The meaning of the term fluctuates between "law" and "instruction, teaching." Most exegetes assume that *tôrâ* is to be understood in a broad sense in the Psalms. Those who speak of "law"[69] point out that this term does not refer here to the laws of Moses or the Pentateuch in the strict sense, but to "all divine revelation as the guide to life." Those who see *tôrâ* as meaning "instruction, teaching" understand the word broadly

---

64. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 291.

65. Pp. 120-21.

66. See also Renker, 247-48.

67. H. H. Guthrie, *Israel's Sacred Songs* (New York, 1966), 191; C. Westermann, *Theologia Viatorum* 8 (1961/62) 280-81 = *Forschung am AT. ThB* 24 (1964), 338-39; Anderson, *Psalms*, II, 807.

68. A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1962), 102.

69. E.g., A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms* (Cambridge, 1902), 700-701.

as the revelation of God's will, the nucleus of this revelation being God's law and its historical manifestation.[70]

In the Psalter *tôrâ* appears to denote God's revelation and its promulgation, presumed to exist in either oral or written form. According to Kraus, we see in the word *tôrâ* that "the transition from oral transmission to a message fixed in writing is in flux."[71] This is not surprising when we remember that the individual psalms arise from very different situations. The *tôrâ* psalms stand in the context of individual piety and exhibit a Dtr and sapiential quality. Ps. 78 and 105, by contrast, move within the framework of covenant theology and are post-Dtr. On the other hand, in Ps. 37:30-31 and 40:8-9(7-8) *tôrâ* stands in an individual prayer, also the context of the new covenant (cf. Jer. 31:31-34). The entire semantic spectrum of *tôrâ* in the Psalter should therefore be seen against a Dtr, sapiential, and prophetic background.

Of the 36 occurrences of *tôrâ* in the Psalms, 32 refer explicitly to Yahweh and 2 to Elohim (37:31; 40:9[8]); 119:72 speaks of the "covenant of Yahweh." Only 78:5 uses *tôrâ* in the absolute sense without a specific reference to Yahweh or God.

b. (1) Ps. 1 is a didactic poem with typically sapiential features. This fact influences the interpretation of the two occurrences of *tôrâ* in v. 2. Here (as in 94:12; 119:1), *tôrâ* appears within a macarism that is itself part of a wisdom poem.[72] Vv. 1-3 speaks of the happiness of righteous or devout individuals, who are described as loving the law (*'ašrê . . . kî 'im bᵉṯôraṯ yhwh ḥepṣô ûḇᵉṯôrāṯô yehgeh yômām wālāyᵉlâ).* Here the "law" of God is not presented as a heavy burden; on the contrary, it is the delight of the righteous, who constantly meditate on it aloud. The psalm does not refer to intellectual study but to an activity controlling everyday life. Learning the *tôrâ* has the goal of putting it into practice as part of one's own life.

According to Josh. 1:8, success and happiness depend on acting in accordance with the law, the expression of God's will. This means having the *tôrâ* constantly before one's eyes. It has normative character and is probably a fixed document (cf. Dt. 17:19). Its substance, however, remains vague. One might assume that the text refers to the Pentateuch or a substantial corpus of OT writings. "In its nature as a preamble to the Psalter, the concept תורה in any case — and even primarily — includes the scriptural scroll of the Psalms."[73]

The unity of Ps. 19 has been challenged, a point that affects the interpretation of *tôrâ.* Many authors distinguish two psalms (vv. 2-7[1-6] and 8-15[7-14]), differing in style and content.[74] The first is a nature hymn that incorporates an ancient hymn to the sun, while the second is a hymn praising the *tôrâ,* with an appended lament.[75] Gese

70. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 114-22, 273-75; idem, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 412-14.

71. *Theology of the Psalms. CC* (Eng. tr. 1986), 34.

72. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/5, 1414.

73. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 116.

74. E.g., ibid., 268-69; I. Fischer, *BN* 21 (1983) 16-25.

75. Fishbane, "Psalm 19"; see also C. Dohmen, *Bibl* 64 (1983) 501-17, who speaks of an artfully constructed didactic poem in the wisdom tradition.

From this perspective, it is easy to understand that the psalmist finds delight in it (vv. 77,92,174; cf. v. 70) and affirms his love for it (vv. 97,113,163,165), at the same time voicing his sincere desire to observe it (*šāmar,* vv. 34b,44,55) with his whole heart. He is saddened because some not only fail to keep it (*lō'-šāmar,* v. 136) but even forsake it (v. 53), distance themselves from it (v. 150), flout it (v. 85), or break it (v. 126). The psalmist professes that he does not forget the *tôrâ* (*tôrāṯᵉkā lō' šāḵaḥtî,* vv. 61,109,153) and does not turn away from it (*mittôrāṯᵉkā lō' nāṭîṯî,* v. 51). In v. 72 he extols the worth of the *tôrâ* with a comparison that recalls Ps. 19:11(10).

Even though Ps. 119 is seen as a complex mosaic that combines a variety of literary genres, in substance it is a unified composition on the theme of *tôrâ,* a theme as broad as the word of God itself, as God's holy law. This word of God — or God's *tôrâ* — probably had a fixed written form. The righteous/devout psalmist meditates on it constantly (vv. 48,97; cf. v. 148). In this psalm the meaning of *tôrâ* is all-embracing; it refers to God's entire revelation, although its concrete outlines cannot be defined.

The anthological nature of Ps. 119 and its various points of contact with other books of the OT suggest that the psalmist probably envisions a much more expansive form of divine revelation. The sapiential character of the psalm suggests that *tôrâ* should be understood here as "instruction" in the broadest sense. Dahood instead translates it as "law," but he explains it as "all divine revelation as the guide of life and prophetic exhortation, as well as priestly direction."[82] Like Ps. 1 and 19, Ps. 119 reflects a style of individual piety marked by love of the *tôrâ,* of God's law, instruction, and revelation.

(2) The same type of piety lies behind Ps. 37:30-31 and 40:8-9(7-8). Here the *tôrâ* is internalized in the heart (*tôraṯ 'ᵉlōhāyw bᵉlibbô,* 37:31) and the inward parts (*wᵉṯôrāṯᵉkā bᵉṯôḵ mē'āy,* 40:9[8]). In 37:30-31 the totality of the human person is emphasized: in the purview of the *tôrâ,* inward disposition (heart), speech (mouth, lips), and actions (steps) constitute a unity. In these verses is realized what is foretold in Jer. 31:33. It is not enough to inscribe the law on a stone or a scroll (cf. Ps. 40:8-9[7-8]); it must be written on the heart, the interior self. Only then can one be guided by the law of God and not the stubbornness of one's own heart (cf. Isa. 51:7).

(3) Ps. 78 and 105 recount the history of Israel in highly structured hymnic language. At the same time these texts have a didactic and sapiential tone. The redactor is concerned to present the individual episodes of history clearly. Here we can observe the interests of the Dtr school. In an introduction that is characteristically sapiential (78:1-2), a teacher invites a hearing for his teaching *(tôrâ).* It is traditional instruction, handed down from parents to children; its central theme is the mighty acts of God in history (vv. 3ff.). In vv. 5-10 *tôrâ* parallels *'ēḏûṯ* and *bᵉrîṯ.* In this context the three terms are interchangeable and denote a body of duties toward God. To break the covenant means to refuse to obey God's law. History furnishes a wealth of examples of Israel's faithlessness and ingratitude in response to God's saving acts. On the basis of this conception is defined the relationship between God and God's people: "The history of the encounter between Yahweh and his people becomes a reflection of the con-

82. Dahood, *Psalms III,* 173.

duct over against the order of salvation of the ברית and of the order of dominion and obedience of the תורה."[83]

The term *tôrâ* appears at the end of Ps. 105, in v. 45, after a survey of God's mighty acts. Observance of the *tôrâ* is the sole consequence of and response to these demonstrations of God's salvific will. The law is part of the covenant; it is the precondition for the relation of Israel to its God and the common life of all creatures upon earth. V. 45 is the only passage in the Psalms where *tôrâ* appears in the plural, in chiastic parallelism with *ḥuqqîm (yišmᵉrû ḥuqqāyw wᵉṯôrōṯāyw yinṣōrû).*

In Ps. 89:31(30) *tôrâ* appears alongside and equivalent to *mišpāṭîm, ḥuqqôṯ,* and *miṣwôṯ.* It is possible that these terms describe the conditions of God's covenant with David and his children. In this text the meaning of *tôrâ* falls within a semantic spectrum similar to that found in Ps. 78 and 105. There is a causal relationship between the *tôrâ* and God's saving acts. Life according to the *tôrâ* is the grateful human response to God's free gift of salvation.

6. *Proverbs and Job.* a. The term *tôrâ* is relatively common in Proverbs, occurring 13 times, but it appears only once in Job. Within the book of Proverbs, there is some concentration in the first section (chs. 1–9: 6 times) and the fifth (25–29; 31:10-31: 5 times), which are generally considered the latest portions of the book. In Job 22:22 as well as in most of the texts in Proverbs, *tôrâ* has the meaning "instruction" or "teaching."

The most important parallels to *tôrâ* are *miṣwâ* (Prov. 3:1; 6:20,23; 7:2; cf. 13:13-14) and *mûsār* (1:8; cf. 4:1-2; 6:23). Strictly speaking, *mûsār* means "reprimand," including the possibility of punishment. In the broadest sense this term comprehends the entire complex of instruction and education carried out by parents and teachers (who can be referred to metaphorically as "father"). In 1:8 and 6:20 the educational roles of both father and mother are emphasized. It is noteworthy that both texts associate *tôrâ* directly with the mother *(tôraṯ 'immeḵā),* while *mûsār* and *miṣwâ* describe the function of the father; this usage suggests a stricter educational role for the father.

Prov. 31:26 says that a capable wife (and mother: v. 28) has "gracious teaching" on her tongue *(wᵉṯôraṯ-ḥeseḏ 'al-lᵉšônāh),* i.e., she does not instruct in a harsh and authoritarian tone but with gentle persuasion. But children must pay close attention to the teaching of both mother and father, as the verbs and their forms (imperative and vetitive) show: *šāma'* (1:8a; 4:1-2; 28:9), *šāmar* (7:2; 28:4b; 29:18), *nāṣar* (6:20a; 28:7), *'al-tiṭṭōš* (1:8b; 6:20b), *'āzaḇ* (4:2; 28:4a), *'al-tiškāḥ* (3:1). This teaching is authoritative. In 4:1-3 (cf. 3:1) it is not clear whether the one who instructs in the *tôrâ* is the father, the mother, or the wisdom teacher. It is important to emphasize that "the teacher-pupil relationship is modelled on the father-son relationship . . . whether it is home or school, the same kind of authority is envisaged in either case and this is radically different from the concept of religious authority represented by *mūsar YHWH*."[84] Education in general and the *tôrâ* in particular are conveyed by parents to their children

83. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 126.
84. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 303.

Blenkinsopp devotes a section of his commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah to the theme of law, and concludes: "Our survey would therefore suggest the conclusion that 'the law' in Ezra-Nehemiah, and therefore Ezra's law *as understood by the redactor,* refers basically to Deuteronomic law supplemented by ritual legislation in the Pentateuchal corpora conventionally designated P and H. . . . These results are corroborated by a survey of Chronicles which uses much the same language, predominantly Deuteronomic, in speaking of the law."[97] Kellermann, on the contrary, reverses these priorities, according more weight to the influence of P than to Deuteronomy and the Dtr redactors. In ChrH, he believes, the *tôrâ* is fundamentally ritual law; the Chronicler is "a student of the Pentateuch as shaped by P."[98]

Our analysis shows that formally and terminologically the Chronicler depends fundamentally on Deuteronomy and DtrH, while agreeing with P in certain details.[99] From Deuteronomy and DtrH, he borrows his terminology and a unitary understanding of the law. But his interest in the cult and his desire to follow the actual law in literal detail draw him to the Priestly literature. The Chronicler thus attempts a synthesis between the two major streams of *tôrâ* interpretation. It is therefore reasonable to assume that he had available an exemplar of the Pentateuch, possibly one very close to its final recension. When he speaks of the *tôrâ* as a unity, he is referring to the totality of Holy Scripture; when he speaks of a particular law, he is generally referring to specific texts of the Pentateuch (esp. Deuteronomy and P). In the few instances that the law in question is not found in the Pentateuch, it is possible that he is constructing hybrid texts, for which he must be allowed a certain amount of artistic freedom.

García López

If we accept the 4th-century-B.C.E. dating of the Temple Scroll proposed by Stegemann and Milgrom, who identify it as the sixth book of the Pentateuch, the Chronicler could also have that book in mind when he speaks of *tôrâ.*

Fabry

For the Chronicler, the *tôrâ* is the great pillar on which his work rests. Ordinarily he understands one of his favorite expressions, "seek God," as an attitude of inward faithfulness to God. Sometimes, however, it means "obey the law" (2 Ch. 14:3[4]; 31:21; also Ezr. 7:10). Its opposite is "forsake God/the law" (2 Ch. 15:2; 12:1). Obedience to the *tôrâ* establishes the special relationship between Israel and God, a relationship that also extends to the individual person (2 Ch. 6:16). Communion with God is thus achieved through the *tôrâ.* As an expression of God's will, it is normative for the Jewish community. Here the Chronicler displays his notion of a normative document

97. J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah. OTL* (1988), 155.

98. P. 75.

99. See II.2.a above.

hattôrâ) that contains the rules of life, made known originally at Horeb. They come from God mediated through Moses, the greatest prophet and lawgiver. It is a teaching summarized in fixed form as *sēp̄er hattôrâ,* a book to be read and studied by all Israel, from the king to the last Israelite. Through it they will learn to fear Yahweh and practice all the words of the *tôrâ (wᵉšāmᵉrû laʿᵃśôṯ ʾeṯ-kol diḇrê hattôrâ hazzōʾṯ,* 31:12; cf. 17:18-19). It is a document preserved in the ark of the covenant in order to serve as a witness against Israel (31:24-29), so that Israel can no longer claim that God's will is unknown, and finally in order that all Israelites may fulfill the words of the Torah (32:46).

3. *Canon.* By equating *tôrâ* with *sēp̄er hattôrâ* and other equivalents, Deuteronomy paved the way for later developments such as the identification of *tôrâ* with the Pentateuch. In its final form the Pentateuch is a composite of narratives in historical style and laws, mostly collected in extensive legal codes. Since Wellhausen, historical-critical study has shown clearly that the law came into being for the most part at a relatively late date. Even later (mid-3d century B.C.E.) is the identification Heb. *tôrâ* = Gk. *nómos* = Pentateuch. The first clear reference to the Pentateuch as the "law" is in the prologue to Sirach.

In the opinion of some scholars, the LXX, which translates *tôrâ* as *nómos,* was responsible for narrowing the meaning of *tôrâ* to its purely nomistic aspect of "law." Others believe that the LXX used the appropriate term.[110] In any case, it is probably safe to assume that late-3d-century Judaism considered the Torah of Ezra (the whole Pentateuch or only the Mosaic law within it) to be binding upon Jerusalem/Judea and the LXX Pentateuch to be binding upon Alexandrian Judaism. In the Hellenistic world, consequently, *nómos* had to mean the same as *tôrâ.* The LXX, however, borrowed the *tôrâ* concept of the late period, so that its use of *nómos* can be awkward, especially in the rendering of earlier texts.[111]

According to Monsengwo Pasinya,[112] in the LXX Pentateuch *nómos* refers to divine revelation considered as a whole, comprising both didactic and legal portions. The Naḥal Ḥever contracts also understood the term in this sense.[113] In these documents *nómos* is translated by Aram. *ʾwrytʾ (ʾôraytā)* as the equivalent to Heb. *tôrâ;*[114] see especially the classic instance in the Fasting Scroll (67-70 C.E.): "On the 28th day of the same month, the good news came to the Jews that they did not have to depart from the law *(dylʾ yʿdwn mn ʾwrytʾ).*"[115] It seems clear, therefore, that the author did not think of

110. See Blank, 259-60, 268-69; Segal; Lightstone; Westerholm.

111. *TDNT,* IV, 1046-47.

112. P. 88.

113. K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Erg. Bd.* (Göttingen, 1994), text *n V.17.42.

114. On the semantic range of this late Jewish term, see M. Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan, 1990), 42-43.

115. Beyer, 556; J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 186-87.

the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. It is also infrequent in the *pesher* literature (16 times, 5 of which are in 1QpHab). There are 6 occurrences in the mss. of Jubilees and 3 in 4QDibHam. The 5 occurrences in 4Q177 (4QCatena^{a}) deserve special attention.[120]

The use of the term *tôrâ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls agrees in many ways with its use in the OT, in both form and meaning. Thus 1QS 5:8 (// 4QS^{b} 2 1:7; 4QS^{d} 1 1:6); 8:22; CD 15:2,9,12 (// 4Q266 17 1:3); 16:2,5 (// 4Q270 10 2:8) employ the phrase *twrt mwšh,* and 1QS 8:15 (// 4QS^{d} 3 1:7; cf. 1QS 1:3) speaks of the *tôrâ* commanded by God through the mediation of Moses. These passages refer to either the Mosaic Torah as a whole or the Pentateuch. Elsewhere the Torah is referred to as a book (*spr htwrh,* CD 5:2), a collection of books (*spry htwrh,* the books of the law in contrast to the books of the prophets, CD 7:15-17), or a revelation from God (*glh,* 1QS 8:1-2; CD 15:13 [// 4Q266 17 1:4]; 5:2-5). In the Temple Scroll, by contrast, *tôrâ* probably does not refer to the Pentateuch as a whole but to specific laws (50:7,17) or the law of the king (56:21; 57:1).[121]

For the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the *tôrâ* was of preeminent importance. At the very beginning of the Manual of Discipline, it is stated that the community rule is laid down "to turn from all evil" and "to constitute a community within the law" (*lšwb mkwl r' . . . lhywt lyḥd btwrh,* 1QS 5:1-2). The vb. → שׁוּב *šûḇ* is often used with reference to avoiding sin (1QS 5:1,14; 10:20; CD 2:5; 15:7; 20:17; etc.) or being converted to the Torah (1QS 5:8 [// 4QS^{b} 2 1:7]; 10:11; CD 15:9; 16:1,4; 4QpPs^{a} 2:3). This "conversion to the Torah" is a new coinage of the Dead Sea Scrolls; it refers to observance of the law, the characteristic attitude and behavior of a devout member of the community.[122] This attitude toward the law implies fulfilling it (*'śh,* 1QS 5:21 [// 4QS^{d} 1 2:1]; 6:18; 1QpHab 7:11; 8:1; 12:5; CD 16:8 [// 4Q271 2 2:9]; 4QFlor 1:7 should be read *m'śy twdh* rather than *m'śy twrh*[123]), observing it (*šmr,* 4Q252 1 5:5; also 6Q9 21 3), or walking according to it (*hlk,* CD 7:7). Transgression of the law, especially if deliberate, is so grievous a sin that the only possible punishment is banishment from the community (1QS 8:20–9:3). Such a punishment clearly shows the importance attached to precise observance of the Torah.

But the Torah of Moses is more than a norm governing the life of the community; it is also the subject of constant study. Among the duties of members of the community "investigating the *tôrâ*" (*[m]drš b/htwrh,* 1QS 6:6; 8:15; CD 6:7 [// 4Q267 2 15]; 7:18 [// 4Q266 3 4:7]; 20:6; 4QFlor 1:11) stands out. Whenever a group of (at least) ten men is present, one of them (if possible a priest) is to study the law day and night (*'yš dwrš btwrh,* 1QS 6:6; cf. 6:3). At first glance, this requirement appears to mean practical

120. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumran-Gemeinde. STDJ* 13 (1994), 108-9.

121. J. Maier, *Temple Scroll. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. tr. 1985), 124.

122. H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur. BBB* 46 (1975), 28-32; idem, "Die Wurzel *šwb* in der Qumrânliteratur," in M. Delcor, ed., *Qumran, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu. BETL* 46 (1978), 286-87.

123. G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. JSOTSup* 29 (1985), 107.

תּוּשִׁיָּה *tûšîyâ;* תֻּשִׁיָּה *tušîyâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. LXX. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning. III. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Many lexicons claim that the noun *tûšîyâ* and the expression *yēš* derive etymologically from a root *yšy,* "be" (Assyr. *išu,* "have"), but this claim is uncertain.[1] If it is true, we are dealing with a *taqṭilat/toqṭilat* form with a shift of *o* to *u.*[2] On the evidence of this etymology, the basic meaning of *tûšîyâ* would be "that which exists," hence "power, ability."[3] This meaning is so vague that we must examine actual usage to define it more precisely.

The noun is cognate with the Ugaritic hapax legomenon *tšyt,*[4] which may be translated as "victory, triumph, success."[5]

2. *LXX.* The LXX provides little assistance in determining the meaning of *tûšîyâ,* since it offers 12 different translations for the 13 occurrences of the word in the OT: *sōtēría* (Job 30:22; Prov. 2:7), *boḗtheia* (Job 6:13), *aspháleia* (Prov. 8:14), *énnoia* (Prov. 3:21), *dýnamis* (Job 26:3), *tṓn katá sé* (11:6), *ischýs* (12:16), *alēthés* (5:12), *sṓsein* (Mic. 6:9), and *eirḗnē* (Sir. 38:8). The readings *kairós* (Prov. 18:1) and *mataían paráklēsin* (Isa. 28:29) appear to have no connection with Heb. *tûšîyâ.* The range of terms used by the LXX nevertheless suggests that the "ability" denoted by *tûšîyâ* should be thought of as more than purely intellectual.

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The noun *tûšîyâ* occurs 13 times in the OT (including Sirach); in Job 30:22b *tᵉšû'â* should be read instead of *tušiwwâ* (= *Q tušîyâ*).[6] All the occurrences

---

tûšîyâ. H. Bauer, "Die hebräischen Eigennamen als sprachliche Erkenntnisquelle," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 73-80, esp. 77; H. A. Brongers, "Miscellanea Exegetica," *Übersetzung und Deutung. FS A. R. Hulst* (Nijkerk, 1977), 30-49, esp. 37-49; M. V. Fox, "Words for Wisdom," *ZAH* 6 (1993) 149-69, esp. 161-65; K. J. Grimm, "The Meaning and Etymology of the Word תּוּשִׁיָּה in the OT," *JAOS* 22 (1901) 35-44; G. Kuhn, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des salomonischen Spruchbuches. BWANT* 57 (1931), esp. 3-4; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte. BBB* 10 (1956), esp. 517-18; G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Eng. tr. Nashville, 1970), esp. 79 and n. 8; N. Shupak, *Where Can Wisdom Be Found? OBO* 130 (1993), esp. 251-56.

1. *BDB,* 1064; *GesB,* 874-75; *HAL,* II, 1713-14.

2. J. Barth, *NSS,* 307 n. 3; criticized by Grimm, 42-44, whose own theory breaks down because there is no evidence for an Assyrian root *ašu,* "help."

3. Bauer, 77.

4. *KTU* 1.3, II, 27.

5. *UT,* no. 812, 2614; *CML*², 159; cf. M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. BietOr* 17 (1965), 74; idem, *Bibl* 55 (1974) 386-87; J. Gray, *UF* 11 (1979) 319; idem, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 43.

6. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 414; for a different opinion see Fox, 163.

happiness and prosperity may be interrupted and counsels composure rooted in religious faith (v. 26).

The pragmatic ingenuity denoted by *tûšîyâ* is a concomitant of wisdom and serves as a beneficial reward for an upright life, but it is not identical with either wisdom or the fear of Yahweh. It is an ethically neutral term. According to Prov. 18:1, for example, a self-indulgent person stirs up strife by any means possible (*bᵉḵol-tûšîyâ yiṯgallā';* but cf. McKane: "against all sound and effective policy,"[11] since *tûšîyâ* is not used pejoratively). In Job 5:12-13 the "*tûšîyâ* of the crafty" parallels "schemes of the wily." The parallelism with *'ēṣâ* (cf. Isa. 28:29) demonstrates also that *tûšîyâ* denotes not only an inward capability but also the result of pragmatic ingenuity, a plan of action (not its success): "He frustrates the devices of the crafty, so that their hands achieve no success. He takes the clever in their own craftiness, and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end" (Job 5:12-13). In 26:3, similarly, the *tûšîyâ* that is given to others is advice.[12]

The sapiential identification of pragmatic wisdom with "the psychic power through which the creator God formed the world so artfully"[13] also makes it possible to ascribe *tûšîyâ* to Yahweh. In Job 12:13-16, as in Prov. 8:14, God's sovereignty is characterized by strength *('ōz)* and instrumental intelligence *(tûšîyâ),* which here serve to frustrate the designs of earthly rulers. In justifying the medicinal arts, which are suspect to the devout, Sirach emphasizes that Yahweh's work manifests itself now and again in the (successful) ministrations of the healing professions, so that neither Yahweh's work *(ma'ᵃśeh)* nor the *tûšîyâ* needed to accomplish it ever rest (Sir. 38:8).

In a similar manner Isa. 28:23-29 uses the analogy of the proper and appropriate actions of the farmer instructed by Yahweh to argue for Yahweh's situational counsel *('ēṣâ)* and discretion *(tûšîyâ).*[14] As in Job 5:12-13, it is questionable to interpret *tûšîyâ* as "success," the necessary consequence of following God's counsel,[15] since the imagery of the similitude describes only the appropriate actions of the farmer; nothing is said of a successful harvest.

It is also possible that Job 11:6, a difficult text (in v. 6b, MT *kî-ḵiplayim* should probably be emended to *kî-pᵉlā'îm*[16]), refers to God's sovereign providence: God's *tûšîyâ* is too wonderful to be known without revelation. Of course this interpretation is uncertain, as is true of all the other occurrences of the expression. It is conceivable that here, in conjunction with miracles and knowledge, *tûšîyâ* denotes intellectual ability: for human *tûšîyâ,* "understanding," the secrets of wisdom are miraculous.[17]

---

11. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 519.

12. M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* (1965), 168; Fox, 164-65; but cf. *HAL,* II, 1714; and Fohrer, *Hiob,* 376, 378-79: "success" in the sense of wisdom literature, where the counsel of the wise always brings success.

13. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos,* 30.

14. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 48-62, esp. 54-55.

15. E.g., O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 261.

16. But cf. J. J. Slotki, *VT* 35 (1985) 229-30: *kî lô tûšîyâ wᵉḏa' kî-ḵiplayim yaššeh lᵉḵā.*

17. G. Hölscher, *Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 32; F. Horst, *Hiob 1–19. BK* XVI/1 (1968), 168; Brongers, 44.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *tûšîyâ* — like *dēʿâ* and *m^e^zimmaṯ ʿormâ* — refers to esoteric knowledge to which only the faithful one is privy (1QS 11:6); he will tell of his knowledge *(daʿaṯ)* with the "counsel of understanding" *(baʿ^a^ṣaṯ tûšîyâ)* (1QS 10:24). i.e., "religious instruction based on his own God-given knowledge."[18] Along with *daʿaṯ, ḥoḵmâ,* and *ʿormâ, tûšîyâ* can also refer to God's omniscience (CD 2:3-4). The word also appears in 4Q215 1 2:10.

Gertz

18. Nötscher, 61.

תַּחֲנוּנִים *taḥ^a^nûnîm;* תְּחִנָּה *t^e^ḥinnâ*

I. Etymology and Usage. II. *t^e^ḥinnâ.* III. Sirach. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls. VI. Rabbinic Judaism.

I. Etymology and Usage. The noun *taḥ^a^nûnîm* occurs only in the plural (a collective or abstract plural for actions conceived of as consisting of individual acts;[1] cf. *taḥ^a^nûnôṯ* in Ps. 86:6, which is probably synonymous). It is a *taqṭūl* form from the hithpael[2] of the root → חנן *ḥnn,* "be merciful,"[3] and means a supplication for mercy or favor[4] — not a formal prayer on a specific occasion, but an expression issuing from an anguished spirit, with no fixed form or manner of recitation.[5] A similar form *(tḥnwnyn)* occurs in Christian Palestinian Aramaic with the meaning "gentleness, sympathy."[6] There are 18 occurrences in the OT, 8 of which are in the Psalms. In Jer. 31:9, following the LXX *(en paraklḗsei), ṭanḥumîm* ("and with consolation") should be read instead of MT *taḥ^a^nûnîm.*[7]

taḥ^a^nûnîm. R. D. Ap-Thomas, "Some Aspects of the Root *Ḥnn* in the OT," *JSS* 2 (1957) 128-48, esp. 137; R. A. Mason, "The Relation of Zech 9–14 to Proto-Zechariah," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 227-39.

1. Michel, 88.
2. *HAL,* II, 1718; W. Zimmerli, *TDNT,* IX, 379.
3. *BLe,* §61xη.
4. Mason, 232.
5. Ap-Thomas, 137.
6. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (1903, repr. Tel Aviv, 1972), 67.
7. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 179; *BHS;* but cf. *HAL,* II, 1719.

As denominatives from *yrt* with a *m* prefix, Syriac has *mērita*[25] and Aramaic has *mêrᵉṯā'*;[26] both mean "must."

3. *Semantics.* Attempts to define the semantic content of *tîrôš* have been shaped by the need to distinguish it from *yayin,* "wine," and/or to derive it from *yrš* II, "press" (rarely from *yrš* I, "take possession"[27]). The range of proposed meanings extends from "wine" (according to Köhler,[28] *tîrôš* is the Aramaic equivalent to non-Sem. *yayin;* van Selms[29] contrasts it to *yayin* as "a more sophisticated word which was mainly used in poetry and proverbial enumerations") to "sweet wine"[30] and "new wine"[31] or "alcoholic must that has already begun to ferment" to "grape juice that has not yet begun to ferment" (Zapletal[32] believes that *tîrôš* can refer to either of the latter), freshly pressed or still within the grape,[33] or even "grape."[34] The definition given by Delcor is self-contradictory ("תירוש denotes unfermented 'grape must' and is an archaic poetic term for wine"), since wine is always fermented.[35] (Cf. the definitions accepted by the European Economic Community: "Wine: a product produced exclusively by the complete or partial alcoholic fermentation of fresh grapes or their juice"; grape juice (or must) is defined as "a liquid product obtained by natural or artificial means from fresh grapes," with a maximum alcoholic content of 1 percent.[36])

A survey of the individual passages confirms that the word has a wide range of meanings, but one qualification may be stated at the outset: no occurrence of *tîrôš* in the OT suggests that it is a technical term for a particular intermediate or final stage of vinification associated with a specific phase of fermentation. All the evidence indicates that *tîrôš* refers to the unprocessed raw material provided by nature, i.e., grapes full of juice. (The term for freshly pressed must is *'āsîs.*[37]) The intended final product, wine, may also be envisioned. In such cases *tîrôš* becomes a kind of synonym of *yayin,* although the latter term does not appear to include the aspect of God's initial natural gift, provided without human intervention.

4. *Series.* The noun *tîrôš* rarely appears by itself (6 times). It usually occurs with *dāḡān,* which precedes it (11 times; exceptions are Mic. 6:15, with *zayiṯ,* and Neh.

---

25. Brockelmann, *LexSyr,* 406.

26. *ANH*³, 235.

27. But see *GesTh,* 633b: "must, new wine, because it inebriates, taking possession of the brain"; also W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 110.

28. Pp. 219-20.

29. Van Selms, *JNSL* 3 (1974) 84; see also Köhler; Brown, 169.

30. Fensham, 299.

31. Rudolph: "new, unclarified wine."

32. Pp. 9-10.

33. Dalman, 371.

34. Naeh and Weitzman; cf. also Bacchiocchi, 22, discussing Dt. 11:13d.

35. P. 351.

36. European Economic Community wine trade regulation no. 822/87, appendix I.10 and I.2.

37. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1977), 28; G. Gerleman, *Ruth — Hohelied. BK* XVIII (1965), 213.

point recognized by Wildberger,[59] albeit not taken into account in his translation and comm.). This verse describes metaphorically what Joel 1:10 says more directly: "the *tîrôš* dries up."

The two other occurrences in the book of Isaiah are in Trito-Isaiah. The prophecy of salvation in Isa. 62:8, based on the dyad *dāg̱ān/tîrôš*, refers to the reversal of a situation foretold in such dearth curses as Dt. 28:51; Zeph. 1:13; Am. 5:11.[60] This passage differs from all the others in speaking clearly of drinking[61] *tîrôš* and describing the labor *(yāgaʿ)* of making it. This labor might refer to the cultivation of vineyards, the process of vinification, or both. Here *tîrôš* seems to mean the wine produced from the grapes, without distinguishing it from *yayin* (e.g., as must). The choice of the word *tîrôš* may have been influenced by the common dyad. It is also possible that this term, which refers to the fruit from which the wine is made, is better suited to emphasizing God as the giver, since it is God's action alone that will bring salvation. The continuation in v. 9 builds on the choice of *tîrôš* by using the vb. *qbṣ*, "gather," which recalls Dt. 11:14.[62]

Isa. 65:8 confirms the interpretation of *tîrôš* as the "juice" found in the grape cluster *('eškôl)*, explicitly calling it a "blessing." Here the *tîrôš* is not itself the object of a promise but the figurative element of a metaphor that proclaims God's refusal to destroy Jacob and Judah (v. 9).

In Jer. 31:12, the prophetic section of a promise of salvation that finally turns into an oracle of Yahweh, the standard triad appears with an independent extension *(bᵉnê-ṣō'n ûḇāqār)* that nevertheless recalls Dt. 12:17 and 14:23. Here it plays its usual role of conjuring up (with *ʿal*) the many blessings given by God, now associated with Zion theology.

Of the three passages in the book of Joel, 1:10 has already been noted. Here too we find the familiar triad of agricultural blessings; this time, however, their threatened failure has less to do with famine — this aspect does not appear until v. 16 — than with the elimination of all sacrificial offerings. Here the prophet attacks the "vital point of the divine covenant."[63] The assurance in 2:19 that God will hear the people's prayers echoes the triad in 1:10, which now, in combination with 1:16, is associated with the satisfaction of their needs. Food offerings are suggested only indirectly, through the mention of rejoicing in the temple (1:16).

Joel 2:24 also uses the triad (but with *bār* instead of *dāgān*), describing the solid and liquid foods separately. The mention of *gōren* and *yeqeḇ* suggests a concrete image of winnowed grain, pressed grape juice, and pressed olive oil. Inclusion of the rain motif (v. 23) recalls Dt. 11:14.

Among the texts using *tîrôš*, Mic. 6:15 has been the subject of controversy: in this section of the promise of God's punishment (vv. 13-15) for commercial dishonesty, some exegetes understand *tîrôš* not as a noun but as the 2d person masc. sg. impf. of a

59. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, 484.

60. Fleischer, *Menschenverkäufern*, 125-26.

61. → שׁתה *šāṯâ*.

62. See above.

63. Deissler, *Hosea, Joel, Amos. NEB* (1982), 71.

receiving the gifts of Yahweh's blessing to the fulfillment of cultic obligations. The mention of cultic obligations is exceptional in the book of Proverbs, though McKane sees the "materialism" behind this association as being common in the book.[69] The striking combination of *tîrôš* and *śāḇa'*, found only here in the OT, appears also in the Karatepe inscription.[70] Considered in isolation, the content of this verse is very close to that of Joel 2:24.

3. *Cultic Use.* A separate and much smaller group of texts speaks of *tîrôš* in the context of cultic offerings. Dt. 18:4 is clearly the earliest in this group; it reserves the firstfruits of the familiar triad together with the first fleece from the sheep to feed and clothe the Levitical priests serving at the central sanctuary.

Nu. 18:12 (assigned by Scharbert[71] to R^P) enhances the quality of the offerings by adding *ḥeleḇ;* here the recipients are the Aaronic priests (v. 8). Only here does the triad begin with *yiṣhār.*

Neh. 10:38(with *dāḡān* replaced by *ʿarîsâ*),40(37,39); 13:5,12 are closely related to the regulations in Nu. 18. The recipients are the priests and Levites, and also the singers and gatekeepers (13:5). In addition to these discordant instructions, different terms are used for the storerooms (13:5, *liškâ;* 13:9, *lešāḵôṯ;* 13:12, *'ôṣārôṯ*).

In 2 Ch. 31:5 the offerings given to the priests and Levites in the time of Hezekiah are presupposed; the triad is supplemented by the addition of honey.

The occurrence in Neh. 5:11 is an outlier: the triad, together with silver (cf. Hos. 2:10[8]), appears in the context of the credit system within which Nehemiah demands the remission of debts.

4. *Sirach.* Outside the OT, *tîrôš* occur in the sapiential admonition Sir. 34(31):25, warning against excessive consumption of wine: *wgm 'l hyyn 'l ttgbr ky rbym hkšyl tyrwš,* "Do not try to prove your strength by wine-drinking; the juice of the grape has destroyed many." This verse also attests to the synonymy of *yayin* and *tîrôš* in the late period.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX almost always uses *oínos* to translate *tîrôš.* The only exceptions are Hos. 4:11, where the pairing with *yayin* leads to the use of *méthysma,* "strong drink," as a parallel expression, and Isa. 65:8, where we find *rhṓx,* "grape." It is also noteworthy that in Ps. 4:8(7) the LXX expands the dyad to a triad, while altering the triad found in Jer. 31(38):12.[72]

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *tîrôš* occurs some 20 times; the context is very fragmentary in 4Q286 5 6, 4Q508 13 3, and 11QT 38:4.

The scrolls use the familiar OT triad (1QH 10:24; 4Q251 5 1; 11QBer 1:9; 11QT

69. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 292, 294.
70. *KAI* 26A.III.7, 9; see I.2 above.
71. J. Scharbert, *Numeri. NEB* (1992), 72.
72. G. Fischer, *Das Trostbüchlein. SBB* 26 (1993), 66.

of Yahweh's omnipotence, the book of Proverbs declares that what matters is not the private judgment of a human being but the incorruptible and certain judgment of Yahweh (Prov. 16:2; 21:2; 24:12). Yahweh "weighs" the spirit or heart,[10] i.e., he determines whether the individual is acting properly (see esp. 24:12). That this observation involves a "fundamental principle of OT anthropology"[11] is shown by early texts that make the same point, such as 1 S. 16:7. Similar is 1 S. 2:3, a text in the Song of Hannah that stands out for its sapiential tone, which uses the niphal of *tkn* as a passive: *wᵉlô'* [*Q*] *niṯkᵉnû ʿᵃlilôṯ*.

Whether Yahweh deals with his people "equitably" is an urgent problem for the exiles. Twice Ezekiel addresses the fundamental question whether Yahweh's ways are "proper, equitable, just" in a prophetic disputation: Ezk. 18:25,29, repeated in abbreviated form in 33:17,20. Throughout these passages the original reading *yhwh* has probably been replaced by the theologically less objectionable *'ᵃḏōnāy*. A later generation was clearly unwilling to associate the name of Yahweh with the accusation brought by the exiles. For the latter, however, the statement that "Yahweh's activity in his ordering of the world,"[12] asserted by the repeated words *yittāḵēn dereḵ*,[13] had become highly questionable. In response Ezekiel demands that the people take responsibility for their own actions and seek the root of their offense. It is the "improper" conduct of Israel that has brought about the catastrophe.

The piel of *tkn* is harder to categorize. It is used in Isa. 40:12 and Job 28:25 in the context of creation. These passages declare that Yahweh "apportioned" the heavens (Isaiah) and the waters (Job), assigning them their place. Here *tkn* denotes the assignment of the "proper" place within the order of creation. Isa. 40:13 creates problems. Like Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah counters the people's unwillingness to accept his message with a prophetic disputation, in which he asks (among other things): *mî-tikkēn 'eṯ-rûaḥ yhwh?* Clearly it would be wrong to overlook the connection with v. 12.[14] In contrast to other occurrences, this text uses *tkn* figuratively, so that we may translate: "Who can measure the nature of Yahweh? Who can say what is proper to the nature of Yahweh?"

Ps. 75:4(3) differs strikingly for the usage we have been describing. In this doxology of divine judgment, when the earth totters, Yahweh declares: *'ānōḵî tikkantî ʿammûḏeyhā* (the same imagery appears in 24:1-2; 104:5). Here *tkn* must mean "keep steady, support" (cf. Aram. *tqn*), a meaning more usually associated with the root → כון *kûn*, from which the form in question cannot derive. Possibly, however, we are dealing with a kind of semantic assimilation, as in the case of *tqn* and *tkn*. In any event, behind Ps. 75:4(3) stands the notion of order, which has already been noted as the fundamental meaning of *tkn*.

---

10. → לב *lēḇ*; → רוח *rûaḥ*; see also H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. tr. 1974), 40-58.

11. F. Stolz, *Samuel. ZBK* 9 (1981), 30.

12. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 385-86.

13. → דרך *drk*.

14. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 50.

The pual ptcp. *mᵉṯukkān* in 2 K. 12:12(11) is usually translated "paid out."[15] The noun it modifies refers to the money for the renovation of the temple. Here once again the basic meaning of *tkn* is clear. The money "paid out" is the amount necessary and equitable for the renovation. The source of vv. 12-13(11-12) is debated, as is their relationship to 2 K. 22:3-11, which has much the same content.[16] This may be the only preexilic instance of the vb. *tkn;* in the light of its other occurrences, however, an exilic dating is more likely for this text as well.

2. *Nouns.* Most of the nominal forms can be subsumed under the heading of "equity," what is proper or appropriate in a particular situation. The Israelites in Egypt are to make a specific quantity of bricks, a number "appropriate" in the eyes of Pharaoh. In the text of Ex. 5 (J),[17] *tōḵen* (v. 18) and *maṯkōneṯ* have the same meaning. We find a similar juxtaposition of the two terms in the exilic period. In Ezekiel's vision of the restoration, the princes are admonished to measure with a "correct measure" (Ezk. 45:11). The *'êp̄â* and *baṯ,* measures of volume for grain and liquids, are to be the same size *(tōḵen 'eḥāḏ);* the *ḥōmer* serves as the "standard" for both *(maṯkōneṯ).* Ezekiel's demand probably reflects a general experience of dishonest weights and measures.[18] Ex. 30:32,37 (P^S)[19] requires a proper measure in the sense of "proportion" in the manufacture of anointing oil and incense.

An historical understanding of what is "proper" is illustrated by 2 Ch. 24:13. This text, which is based on 2 K. 12:1-22,[20] speaks of restoring the temple *'al-maṯkuntô.* Here what is proper is what existed previously. Ezk. 43:10, which uses *toḵnîṯ* in a similar sense, goes a step further. In the context of Yahweh's entry into the new temple, the prophet is commanded to describe this temple to the Israelites, that they may measure[21] it *tᵉḵunāṯô* (cj.). This vision of the temple will also lead the Israelites to recognize their own sinfulness. The layout of the temple thus takes on a theological quality: the root *tkn* stands for what Yahweh finds proper. The implicit notion of "perfection" as the acme of what is right and proper lies behind Ezk. 28:12. A *qînâ* over the king of Tyre describes him as *ḥôṯām* (cj.) *toḵnîṯ,* the "signet of perfection," envisioning the king as representing the city.[22]

There is some uncertainty as to the existence of a village named *tōḵen.* According to 1 Ch. 4:32, it was located in the tribal region of Simeon, in the Negeb. A parallel list in Joshua 15:42 and 19:7 speaks instead of *'eṯer* (cf. 1 S. 30:30) or *'ᵃṯāḵ.* Whether *tōḵen* is simply a mistake[23] or represents a real but unidentified site remains an open

15. O. Eissfeldt, *ZAW* 63 (1951) 109 n. 8.

16. H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 179-83.

17. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 247-50.

18. On the units of measurement see G. Schmitt, *BRL*², 204-6.

19. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1962), 239; G. Beer, *Exodus. HAT* I/3 (1939), 149, with a detailed discussion of the materials.

20. See II.1 above.

21. → מדד *mdd.*

22. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 91; G. R. Driver, *Bibl* 45 (1958) 158-59.

23. M. Noth, *Josua. HAT* I/7 (³1971), in loc.; et al.; see also Y. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, ²1979), 299 n. 51.

תָּלָה/תָּלָא *tālâ/tālāʾ*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. 1. Occurrences and Usage; 2. "Hang" and "Impale"; 3. Esther. III. Ancient Versions. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The root *tlh,* "hang" (with its by-form *tlʾ,*[1] which occurs several times in the OT[2]), has cognates in many Semitic languages. In Aramaic, *tlʾ* or *tly* appears in various dialects, always with the meaning "hang."[3] In Ethiopic we find *talawa* with the meaning "follow, pursue, be attached to."[4] Modern Arabic has the form *talā,* also meaning "follow,"[5] and *talla,* "throw down, throw to the ground";[6] Old South Arabic has *tlw,* "extend, transfer."[7] In Akkadian we find *tullû* II, "decorate, drape";[8] whether *talālu(m),* "stretch out," can also mean "suspend" and be treated as a cognate is disputed.[9] In later Hebrew, *tlh* with the pass. ptcp. *tālûy* often means "be uncertain, dubious," as well as "hang, make dependent."[10]

---

tālâ. J. M. Baumgarten, "Does *tlh* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 (1972) 472-81; idem, "Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law," *FS H. Orlinksky. ErIsr* 16 (1982) 7*-16*; idem, "Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *Studies in Qumran Law. SJLA* 24 (1977) 172-82; L. Díez Merino, "La crucifixión en la antiqua literatura judiá (período intertestamental)," *Estudios eclesiasticos* 51 (1976) 5-27; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Observations nouvelles sur l'expression 'suspendu vivant sur le bois' du Comm. de Nahum (II.8) à la lumière du Rouleau du Temple (11QTemple Scroll LXIV 6-13)," *CRAI* 1972, 709-20; D. Flusser, "The Crucified One and the Jews," *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem, 1988), 575-87; D. J. Halperin, "Crucifixion, the Nahum Pesher and the Rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation," *JJS* 32 (1981) 32-46; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Eng. tr. Philadelphia, 1977); H.-W. Kuhn, "Kreuzignung," *NBL,* II, 548-49; idem, "Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit," *ANRW,* II/25.1 (1982), 648-793; M. J. Mulder, "Betekent (על-[ה]עץ) תלה in het boek Esther 'spietsen op een paal'?" *NedTT* 21 (1966/67) 337-47; H. Shanks, "New Analysis of the Crucified Man," *BAR* 11/6 (1985) 20-21; V. Tzaferis, "Crucifixion," *BAR* 11/1 (1985) 44-53; Y. Yadin, "Pesher Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered," *IEJ* 21 (1971) 1-12; idem, *Temple Scroll,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1983), esp. I, 373-79; II, esp. 289-91; J. Zias, "Death and Disease in Ancient Israel," *BA* 54 (1991) 147-59; idem and E. Sekeles, "The Crucified Man from Givʿat ha-Mivtar," *IEJ* 35 (1985) 22-27; F. T. Zugibe, "Death by Crucifixion," *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal* 17 (1984) 1-13; idem, "Two Questions About Crucifixion," *BRev* 5/2 (1989) 35-43.

1. *HAL,* II, 1736.
2. See II.1 below; also *GK,* §75rr; *BLe,* §57t″; Bergsträsser, II, §30q.
3. *AP* 71.19 (also possibly 71.33; 81.39); *DISO,* 329; *MdD,* 487; *LexSyr,* 824-25; *ChW,* II, 539.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 550-51; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (1987), 575.
5. Wehr, 97.
6. Lane, I/1, 310.
7. Beeston, 148.
8. *AHw,* III, 1369.
9. Cf. *AHw,* III, 1309, with R. Border, *VT* 22 (1972) 389; *HAL,* II, 1738.
10. W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur,* I (1899, repr. Darmstadt, 1965), 198; II (1905), 233.

II. 1. *Occurrences and Usage.* Forms of the vb. *tlh,* primarily in the qal, occur 28 times in the OT: Gen. 40:19,22; 41:13; Dt. 21:22-23; Josh. 8:29; 10:26 (bis); 2 S. 4:12; 18:10; 21:12 *(K);* Isa. 22:24; Ezk. 15:3; 27:10-11 (piel); Ps. 137:2; Job 26:7; Cant. 4:4; Lam. 5:12 (niphal); Est. 2:23 (niphal); 5:14; 6:4; 7:9-10; 8:7; 9:13-14,25. In addition, *wtyn* in 2 S. 18:9 should probably be read as *wytl* (niphal).[11] The form *tl'* occurs 3 times: Dt. 28:66; 2 S. 21:12 *(Q);* Hos. 11:7. In Sir. 7:8 the LXX *(adelphón gnḗsion)* suggests that Heb. *tlwy ('t)* should be emended to *tlym.*[12]

The meaning of the verb in the OT is almost always "hang, suspend." In Gen. 40:19; Dt. 21:22; Josh. 8:29; 10:26, people are hung on a tree or post *('al-[hā]'ēṣ)* after being executed. The victims include both non-Israelites (Egyptians or Canaanites) and Israelites condemned to death. In Dt. 21:22 it is important to determine whether the hanging is the cause of death, in which case the *waw* of *weṯālîṯā* may be considered a *waw explicativum,*[13] or whether the criminal must first be executed and then suspended on a post, in which case the *waw* can be treated as the sign of a consecutive perfect. The latter interpretation gained general acceptance in later rabbinic literature.[14] V. 23 goes on to require that the corpse not remain all night on the post but be buried the same day.

With the prep. *'al* but without mention of *'ēṣ, tālâ* refers to the hanging of both persons (2 S. 4:12) and objects (Ezk. 15:3; 27:11 [piel]; Ps. 137:2; Job 26:7; Cant. 4:4). We also find *tālâ* used metaphorically with *'al* in the sense of "hang" (Isa. 22:24: Eliakim will be like a peg on which all the crockery is hung).

The verb is also used with various other prepositions: *minneged* (Dt. 28:66), *be* (2 S. 18:10; Ezk. 27:10), *le* (Hos. 11:7). In 2 S. 18:10 a man reports having seen Absalom hanging in an oak; Ezk. 27:10 describes shield and helmet hanging "within you." Dt. 28:66 uses *tālā'* figuratively: life will hang in danger "before you" — the people must fear for their lives.

Hos. 11:7a is unique. This text is difficult and, in the opinion of many, corrupt.[15] The MT reads something like "and my people are bent [= hang] on turning away from me,"[16] but the translations of the ancient versions diverge from the MT at many points. Nyberg[17] believed that תלוא "derives from the *t*-prefix subst. תלאה," with the meaning "someone who will not or cannot bring himself to consent to (ל) something."[18] Kuhnigk instead reads *tillā'ûm,* the 3d person masc. pl. of *lā'â* II, "be strong," with an

11. See II.2 below.

12. T. Nöldeke, *ZAW* 20 (1900) 85; see also M. H. Segal, *Sēper ben-Sirā' haššālēm* (Jerusalem, ²1958), 48.

13. M. Rose, *5. Mose. ZBK* 5/1 (1994), esp. 130ff.: death by impalement.

14. Yadin; J. Maier, *Temple Scroll. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. tr. 1978), 132-34; M. J. Bernstein, *JQR* 74 (1983) 21-45; F. Parente, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 27 (1977) 79-136; M. Wilcox, *JBL* 96 (1977) 85-99; see also II.4 below.

15. See *BHS;* also *HAL,* II, 1736.

16. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1974), 192; M. Nissinen, *Prophetie, Redaktion und Fortschreibung im Lichte von Hosea 4 und 11. AOAT* 231 (1991), 254, with n. 103.

17. H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche. UUÅ* 1935/36, 88.

18. Similarly W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 211; C. van Leeuwen, *Hosea. POT* (1969), 227, deriving *tl'ym* from the vb. *l'h* and raising objections to this figurative use of *tlh/'.*

enclitic *mem* and a preformative *taw*.[19] He translates roughly as follows: "They make themselves strong in their turning away" (cf. EÜ: "My people persist in their faithlessness"). But it is not clear why this text cannot be using the vb. *tlʾ* in a figurative sense.[20]

In Gen. 40:22; 41:13; Dt. 21:23; 2 S. 21:12; Lam 5:12, *tlh/ʾ* is used without a preposition. In the first three texts, human beings or their corpses are the object. Lam. 5:12 uses the niphal: "Princes are hung up by the hand of the enemy." In Dt. 21:23, as already discussed, we have a qal passive participle referring to the individual who has been hung up, whose corpse must not be allowed to remain overnight but must be buried on the same day (see also Josh. 8:29; 10:26-27; also John 19:31).[21] The verse adds: "for anyone hung on a tree is cursed before God." Does this mean that God has cursed him (many translations, including LXX, Gal. 3:13, and NRSV)[22] or that he represents God's curse?[23] The Dtn author supports this requirement by a reference to defiling and thus imperiling the land. This practice was probably based originally on the fear that the spirit of the slain individual would come for vengeance in the night.[24]

2. *"Hang" and "Impale."* Besides the vb. *tlh* in 2 S. 21:12, we find the form *tqʿw* in 1 S. 31:10//1 Ch. 10:10, which some exegetes would emend to *hōqiʿû*, a hiphil of *yqʿ*, "impale."[25] Stoebe[26] and Rudolph[27] prefer to retain the MT in 1 Ch. 10:10.[28] Within the OT there is a substantial difference in usage between "hanging" and "impaling." The vb. *tlh/ʾ* became practically a technical term for the hanging up of criminals. Sometimes other equivalent terms were used, such as *śîm* or *nāṯan* (Ex. 26:32; 40:5,8,21, 28,33), *ntn* hophal (2 S. 18:9, but read as *tlh* niphal in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the ancient versions[29]), *ḥnq* niphal (2 S. 17:23: "he hanged himself") and piel (Nah. 2:13: "strangle"), and above all *yqʿ* hiphil (Nu. 25:4; 2 S. 21:6,9; cj. 31:10: "impale"; others believe that this means "throw off a cliff"[30]) and hophal (2 S. 21:13).

It is unlikely that hanging by itself ever served as a form of capital punishment in Israel. The relevant texts appear to suggest instead that those who were condemned, above all blasphemers, were first killed and then hung up, so that hanging was more an additional punishment, e.g., after stoning (as in 2 S. 4:12; cf. also the expression "hang in the light of the sun" [Nu. 25:4], the hanging of the corpses of Saul and his sons on a

19. W. Kuhnigk, *Nordwestsemitische Studien zum Hoseabuch. BietOr* 27 (1974) 136.

20. *HAL*, II, 1736.

21. S. E. Löwenstamm, *EMiqr*, IV, 949.

22. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, I, 379.

23. C. J. Labuschagne, *Deuteronomium II. POT* (1987), 182.

24. J. Wijngaards, *Deuteronomium. BOT* (1971), 237.

25. E.g., J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1871), 149, citing P. de Lagarde; *GesB*, 888; *KBL*², 1040; *HAL*, II, 431.

26. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 522.

27. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 92.

28. See also *LexHebAram*, 909.

29. *BHS*.

30. W. R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (London, ²1894), 398 n. 2; R. Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite* (Paris, 1921), 288.

תלל *tll* II; התל *htl;* הֲתֻלִים *h^aṯulîm;* מַהֲתַלּוֹת *mah^aṯallôṯ*

I. 1. Forms; 2. Etymology. II. 1. Constructions and Semantic Field; 2. Meanings. III. Ancient Versions.

I. 1. *Forms.* According to the MT, the root *tll* II (usually translated "deceive")[1] occurs only in the H stem, with 8 instances of the hiphil and 1 of the hophal. In the hiphil we find two forms of the suffix conjugation (*hēṯel* [*hēṯēl*] in Gen. 31:7 and *hēṯaltā* [for *haṯillôṯā*] in Jgs. 16:10,13,15) and two of the prefix conjugation (*yᵉhāṯellû* in Jer. 9:4[Eng. 5] and *tᵉhāṯēllû* in Job 13:9); the latter exceptionally preserve the prefix of the H stem (*/ha/*).[2] This is standard in Old Aramaic[3] and common in Imperial and Biblical Aramaic,[4] but the Aramaic forms can hardly have been a primary influence on *tll* hiphil.[5] Other forms include the inf. const. *hāṯēl* (Ex. 8:25[29]) or *kᵉ-hāṯēl* (Job 13:9) and the hophal suffix conjugation *hûṯal* (Isa. 44:20); there is no reason to doubt this occurrence of the root in the consonantal text.[6]

The deverbal noun *mah^aṯallôṯ,* "illusions," in Isa. 30:10 is not pointed as a hiphil fem. pl. ptcp. of *tll.*[7] The form is understood most simply as a *maqṭal* form of a base *htl,* with secondary gemination of the final consonant.[8] Semantically, however, the text assumes the lexical meaning of *tll* hiphil, which suggests that the base *htl* used by the verbal noun is a variant of *tll* hiphil.

The morphological analysis of *mhtlwt* in Isa. 30:10 as well as the prefix conjugation forms of the hiphil without syncope of the */h/* (the expected regular form */yatill/* = *yāṯēl* does not appear at all) necessarily raise the question of the relationship of the

---

tll II. J. Blau, "Etymologische Untersuchungen auf Grund des palaestinischen Arabisch," *VT* 5 (1955) 337-44, esp. 340-41; F. C. Fensham, "The Stem *HTL* in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 9 (1959) 310-11; M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (Zurich, 1964), esp. 90-91, 212-14; H.-P. Müller, "Aramaisierende Bildungen bei Verba mediae geminatae — ein Irrtum der Hebraistik?" *VT* 36 (1986) 423-37, esp. 425-26; F. Nötscher, "Entbehrliche Hapaxlegomena in Jesaia," *VT* 1 (1951) 299-302, esp. 302; A. D. Singer, "The Derivation of Hebrew התל," *JQR* 36 (1945/46) 255-59.

→ רמה *rmh*

1. On **tll* I and *tll* II see *GesB,* 804; *KBL*², 1030; *HAL,* II, 1739-40.

2. E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache,* II/1 (Leipzig, 1895), 422; *BLe,* §25f′-h′.

3. R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden, 1969), §55, with p. 19 n. 11.

4. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 258-59, 269, etc.

5. See I.2 below.

6. Contra I. Eitan, *HUCA* 12-13 (1937/38) 78-79, who proposes the conjectural emendation *hôṯēl* (or *hāṯûl*), "foolish," on the basis of Arab. *hatara.*

7. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 140, 146: "that which deceives"; see also *HAL,* II, 1740; also *HAL,* I, 554; and the discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls below.

8. *NSS,* §174c; *BLe,* §§24f,g; 71c: */mahtalōṯ/.*

MT *tll* forms to the narrative form *way^ehattēl* in 1 K. 18:27, which appears to be a piel from a base *htl* with the meaning "mock," as well as to the verbal noun (abstract pl.) *h^aṯulîm,* "mockery," in Job 17:2. From Gesenius[9] to the present, the form *way^ehattēl* has often been derived directly from the base *tll* hiphil.[10] Müller[11] interprets the gemination of the initial consonant of the base not (simply) as an "Aramaism" (as is usual), but as a phonological means of semantic and lexical differentiation found in geminate verbs, such as *tll* hiphil:[12] "deceive" *(y^ehāṯēllû)* — "mock" *(way^ehattēl).* The verbal noun *h^aṯulîm* makes clear, however, that in Classical Hebrew usage (in the broader synchronic sense), *way^ehattēl* must be treated as a piel of *htl.*[13] The hapax legomenon *tôlāl* in Ps. 137:3 is not associated with the lexeme *tll* hiphil.[14]

Both of the occurrences in Sirach, *'l thtl* (11:4, mss. A and B) and *yhtl* (13:7, ms. A), may derive from the base *htl* (piel).[15] The contexts, however, suggest that the two verb forms have different meanings.[16] Since the semantic differentiation supports a morphological differentiation (*tll* hiphil and *htl* piel) as well, it seems reasonable to read *t^ehattēl,* "mock," in 11:4 and *y^ehāṯēl,* "deceive," in 13:7. But despite the differing semantic nuances in the two passages, the possibility cannot be ruled out that both verb forms derive from *htl* piel (cf. *htl* in the sense of "deceive" in *mhtlwt* and the form in 4Q437 discussed below).

Until recently only the deverbal noun from Isa. 30:10[17] was attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Nötscher's interpretation of the form *mtlwt* in 1QIs^a 30:10 (omission of <*h*> or derivation from *tll* instead of *htl*) is almost certainly wrong.[18] It is due instead to the familiar phenomenon of disappearing laryngeals in the language of the Qumran scribes.[19] The same word follows the consonantal text and the context of Isa. 30:10 in CD 1:18 and 4Q266 2 1:22: *b-ḥlqwt,* "smooth, deceitful things"//*b-mhtlwt,* "deceptions." That the word in the scrolls presupposes a derivation from *htl* is demonstrated by the remarkable plene orthography *b-mhwtlwt* in 4Q437 4 1, which points to a (nominalized) pual ptcp. of *htl,* "feigned."[20] If the hophal ptcp. of *tll* were intended, the form would have been written *mwtlwt,* corresponding to the regular *hûṯal* in Isa. 44:20.

---

9. *GesTh,* 1504-5.

10. See esp. *GK,* §67y; *BLe,* §§25f', 58p', with the same meaning.

11. P. 424, following E. Kautzsch, in C. Bezold, ed., *Orientalische Studien. FS T. Nöldeke* (Giessen, 1906), 776.

12. Müller, 425-26.

13. *GesB,* 189; König, 84-85; *KBL*², 243; *HAL,* I, 257.

14. *LexHebAram,* 892; *HAL,* II, 1700-1701.

15. Z. Ben-Hayyim, ed., *Book of Ben Sira* (Jerusalem, 1973), 130: *htl;* followed by W. Richter, *Sirach. ATS* 33/16 (1993), 29, 37.

16. See II.2 below.

17. See above.

18. P. 302.

19. E. Y. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a). STDJ* 6 (1974), 506, 508-11.

20. E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls. HSS* 29 (1986), 107, under the rubric of words not attested in Biblical Hebrew or Middle Hebrew.

c. The third, more frequently proposed, considers *htl* a secondary base derived from the hiphil of *tll*.[29] The primary base *tll* is associated with Arab. *dalla* I, "lead, show; be coquettish, flirt, flatter" (also stem V) and *dalīla,* "cunning, flirtatious (woman)."[30]

In summary, we propose the following etymological relationship: in (Classical) Hebrew, *tll* and *htl* should be considered variant roots that developed distinctively nuanced meanings (note esp. the orthographic forms *hûṯal* from *tll* and *h*^{a}*ṯulîm* from *htl*). This holds true even if, as is probably the case, *htl* developed from an earlier H stem of *tll (htl < h-tll < tll);* there is a similar phenomenon in Arabic, where causatives of geminate or hollow verbs tend to develop as independent verbs.[31] The prefix conjugation forms of *tll* hiphil that irregularly (in Hebrew) preserve the */ha/* morpheme would be explained more easily if they were reinforced in Classical Hebrew usage by phonetically similar forms of the prefix conjugation of *htl* piel.

In synchronic usage *tll* and *htl* probably influenced each other. That *htl* was used in the D stem seems to be due precisely to this mutual influence (cf. the prefix conjugation forms of the two bases) as well as the semantic profile of this stem (factitive, resultative), and possibly the analogy of internal phonetic differentiation in the hiphil of geminate verbs.[32] The noun */mahtalôṯ/*, which is associated semantically with *tll* hiphil while deriving from the base *htl,* likewise argues for such interference between the two bases.

A survey of other Semitic languages reveals no etymological parallels to *tll/htl* in Canaanite, Aramaic, or Akkadian. For comparative purposes Jewish Aram. *tltl,* "mock,"[33] carries only limited weight. The only possible parallels are in Arabic. The proposed relationship of Heb. *tll* to Arab. *dalla,*[34] which converges semantically with Heb. *tll* hiphil, especially in stems I and V ("be coquettish, dally"), presents certain phonological problems, but is possible. If we define the semantic domain of *tll* as "play games with someone (esp. verbally), deceive,"[35] a differentiation of *htl* piel in the direction of "play games with someone, mock" would be understandable within the context of Hebrew. There is therefore no need to associate Heb. *htl* etymologically with Arab. *hatara* (I/IV: "make/become feeble-minded, foolish"; III: "scold, abuse"; X: "be neglectful, contemn, mock")[36] or Palestinian Arab. *hattala* (II, "neglect").[37] If both Arabic etymologies (*dalla* and *hatara*) were correct, Heb. *tll* and *htl* would have to be considered etymologically distinct roots, which hardly squares with the Hebrew evidence.

---

29. *htl: GesB,* 189; *BDB,* 251; König, 84-85; *KBL*^{2}, 243; *HAL,* I, 257; also Bergsträsser, II, §19k n. a; E. Klein, *Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language* (New York, 1987), 180, 704.

30. E.g., R. Dozy, *Supplément,* I (1881/1981), 454-56.

31. *VG,* I, 521-22.

32. See I.1 above; also Müller.

33. M. Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan, 1990), 584.

34. See I.2.c above.

35. See II.2 above, esp. with respect to Gen. 31:7.

36. *LexHebAram,* 199.

37. Blau, 340-41.

14:15; used in the sense of "deceive, spy out" in 2 S. 3:25). In other passages, too, the context shows that *tll* hiphil refers to "speaking lies": Jer. 9:4a(5a) (cf. "not speak the truth [*'emet*]," v. 4b[5b]; "speak lies" [*dbr* piel *šeqer*], v. 4c[5c]; "speak deceit" [*dbr* piel *mirmâ*], v. 7b[8b]; cf. v. 5[6]); Job 13:9 (cf. the description of Job's friends as *ṭōpelê-šāqer,* "people who whitewash with lies," in v. 4 and the rhetorical question in v. 7 as to whether they are speaking "falsely" and "deceitfully" for God [*dbr* piel *'awlâ/ /remîyâ*]).

Other contextual synonyms of *tll* hiphil include: *nṭh* hiphil, "lead astray" (Isa. 44:20); *'qb,* "defraud," and *hlk rāḵîl,* "slander" (Jer. 9:3[4]); *š''* hiphil *l-,* "flatter" (Sir. 13:6).[40]

The subst. obj. *mahatallôṯ* in Isa. 30:10 concludes a series that is semantically unmistakable: *lō' ḥzh nekōḥôṯ,* "not see what is right"//*dbr* piel *ḥalāqôṯ,* "speak smooth, flattering things,"//*ḥzh mahatallôṯ,* "see illusions." For *htl* piel in the sense of "mock," we note the contextually and lexically synonymous *qls* piel *b-,* "deride,"[41] in the vetitives *'l thtl (b-)//w'l tqls (b-)* in Sir. 11:4ab. The subst. subj. *hatulîm,* "mockery," in the noun clause Job 17:2 parallels the hiphil inf. const. of *mrh* (*hammerôṯām,* "their wilful behavior"): "and my eye spends the night (sleepless) on account of their willfulness" (v. 2b). V. 6 (MT) returns to the theme: "He made me a byword for the people" *(limšōl 'ammîm).*[42]

2. *Meanings.* For the lexical and contextual meaning of *tll* hiphil, it is significant that the verb never appears with God as subject (first syntagm). It is only human beings who "deceive" each other and at most make the absurd attempt to deceive God (Job 13:9).[43] For the semantic potential of the verbal base and its instantiation in particular texts, the occurrences in narrative are of interest, especially Gen. 31:7 in its context. Addressing Rachel and Leah (31:4,5-13 [E[44]]), Jacob, vindicated by God for his unjust treatment at the hands of Laban, complains about the deceptive conduct of his father-in-law, who has changed his wages ten times (v. 7; cf. v. 42). This extremely capricious and hence totally undependable conduct on the part of Laban gives *tll* hiphil the contextual sense of "play games with someone" or "make sport of someone."[45]

A rather different Jacob appears in Gen. 31:20,26 (also v. 27): here Jacob "deceives" *(gnb 'eṯ-lēḇ)*[46] Laban by concealing his intent to run away. This Jacob can hardly belong to the same textual stratum as 31:7;[47] he must be assigned to a later redaction[48] or, more likely, an earlier tradition (possibly J[49]). In the final text of Gen.

---

40. See also *HAL,* II, 1613, s.v. *š''* II, on the probable occurrence of *tll* hiphil, "deceive," in v. 7.
41. *HAL,* II, 1105.
42. On the paradigmatic lexical field of *tll* II hiphil, see also M. Kartveit, → XIII, 502-3.
43. See II.1 above.
44. But cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. tr. 1985), 490-91.
45. Well put by B. Jacob, *First Book of the Bible: Genesis* (Eng. tr. New York, 1974), 207.
46. See I.1 above.
47. E.g., H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. tr. 1997), 331-32.
48. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 487, 493-94.
49. J. Scharbert, *Genesis 12–50. NEB* (1985), 210-11, 213-14.

moved from the true state of affairs *(n^e^kōḥôṯ)*. The whole section 30:8-11 voices Isaiah's deep disappointment with the Judahite authorities in Jerusalem, who are totally out of touch with reality, trusting in political machinations (30:1-5,6-7) rather than "the Holy One of Israel" (v. 11).

The two instances of *tll* hiphil in wisdom literature, Job 13:9 and Sir. 13:7, once again lay the basis for the element of deceptive and deceitful speech that is central to the lexical meaning of the verb.[51] Of course, Job 13:9 extends the meaning of the verb to include all possible forms of deception (mental and verbal), none of which are of any avail when God searches out *(ḥqr)* a mortal. Characteristically, Job makes this statement with reference to his friends, branding them as liars who would speak on behalf of God (13:4,7-8), whose maxims are worthless dust (v. 12), who should simply hold their tongues (v. 5).

The contextually equivalent statements in Sir. 13:4,5,6 show clearly that *yhtl bk* in v. 7 is to be understood in the sense of *tll* hiphil, "deceive."[52] The basic tenor of Ben Sirach's warning is clear: as long as a rich person (*ʿšyr,* v. 3) finds it advantageous, he will speak to you with fine flattery (*yyṭyb dbryw ʿmk,* v. 5; *whšyʿ lk* [from *šʿʿ* hiphil, "flatter"], v. 6b); he will smile at you and encourage you (v. 6c,d). In this fashion "he deceives you" or "puts/has you on" (v. 7b). This interpretation is even clearer if we may take *ʿrṣ* hiphil in *yʿryṣk* (v. 7c) not in its Biblical Hebrew sense of "terrify" but in its Middle Hebrew sense of "praise":[53] "Twice, thrice he will praise you." How close deceitful flattery is to mockery may be seen in the final clauses of v. 7 (d-f), where "shaking his head" should probably be taken as a gesture of derision (vv. 7-8). We also note the contextual association of "mockery," "lies," "leading astray," and "deceptions" *(mhtlwt)* in CD 1:14,15,18.

The vb. *htl* piel, "mock, deride," clearly expresses verbal denigration and abuse coupled with contempt:[54] 1 K. 18:27; Sir. 11:4 (cf. v. 2); see also the subst. *h^a^ṯulîm* in Job 17:2 (cf. v. 6).

III. Ancient Versions. The LXX accurately reproduced the sense of Heb. *tll* in prose contexts, using several lexemes: *parakroúesthai,* "mislead, deceive, cheat" (Gen. 31:7); *exapatán,* "deceive, dupe" (Ex. 8:25[29]); *paralogízesthai,* "miscalculate, deceive, dupe, outwit" (Jgs. 16:10,13,15; frequently used to translate *rmh* II). The LXX translators had a harder time with the poetic texts, especially in sapiential passages, less in the prophets. In Isa. 44:20 the LXX appears to telescope the two verbal forms *hûṯal hiṭṭāhû: kaí planṓntai,* "and they are led astray/go astray" (cf. Tertullian: *et errant*). Similarly, the translation of the noun *mah^a^ṯallôṯ* in Isa. 30:10 is substantially accurate: *plánēsis,* "error, deception." In Jer. 9:4(5) the LXX probably read the prefix conjugation of *htl* instead of *tll: katapaízesthai,* "play games with, mock." In Job 13:9c

51. See II.1 above.

52. See I.1. above, with *HAL,* II, 1740; contra G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 537: "mock."

53. E.g., Jastrow, 1123.

54. *HP,* 246.

mentiri in v. 15). This translation suggests that he posits the identical verbal base *htl* in both cases, with different meanings. In the other passages with forms of *tll* or *htl,* the Vg. displays a variety of interpretations and influences: *circumvenire* ("circumvent, deceive, delude") in Gen. 31:7 and the corresponding *fallere* in Ex. 8:25(29) fit with the sense of the MT, as does *errores* in Isa. 30:10 (Symm. *planas*). In Isa. 44:20 the Vg., like the Tg., translates with an attributive phrase: *cor insipiens,* "the foolish heart" (with *nṭh* hiphil distinguished semantically as *adorare*). Jer. 9:5 (MT 9:4) with *deridere,* "deride, mock," follows the semantic lead of the LXX, whereas Job 13:9 reflects the meaning of MT *tll* hiphil *(. . . aut decipietur ut homo, vestris fraudulentiis).* Like the Syriac, the Vg. takes Job 17:2 as Job's declaration of innocence, albeit in a very general sense (*non peccavi,* "I have not sinned"). For Sir. 11:4 and 13:8 (Heb. 7), the Vg. uses a Lucianic text (from LXX).

Irsigler

תָּמַהּ *tāmah;* תִּמָּהוֹן *timmāhôn*

I. Occurrences. II. Basic Meaning. III. Theological Usage: 1. Verb; 2. Noun. IV. 1. Sirach; 2. LXX; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Occurrences. The vb. *tmh* qal occurs 8 times in the Hebrew OT: Gen. 43:33; Isa. 13:8; 29:9; Jer. 4:9; Hab. 1:5; Ps. 48:6(Eng. 5); Job 26:11; Eccl. 5:7(8); Hebrew Sir. 11:13,21 (the last is fragmentary). There are also 2 occurrences of the hithpael: Hab. 1:5 and Isa. 29:9; in the latter, the reading *hittammᵉhû* is supported by Hab. 1:5.[1] Finally, there are 2 occurrences of the subst. form *timmāhôn* (Dt. 28:28; Zec. 12:4).

II. Basic Meaning. To identify the basic meaning of *tmh,* it is important to examine carefully the context of each instance. We note immediately that of 10 occurrences of the verb, 4 are related explicitly to the vb. → ראה *rā'â,* "see," and 2 others have an indirect association with visual perception. We note also that, except in Eccl. 5:7, the verb occurs only in plural constructions and that the substantive always refers to a plurality. Thus *tāmah* denotes a human reaction (transferred figuratively to horses in Zec. 12:4 and the pillars of heaven in Job 26:11) consequent on highly specific visual

---

tāmah. W. Eckhardt and C. Riepl, "Zur Grammatizität der Grammatik, am Beispiel der Basis G-*TMH,*" in W. Gross, H. Irsigler, and T. Seidl, eds., *Text, Methode und Grammatik. FS W. Richter* (St. Ottilien, 1991), 41-55.

1. *HAL,* II, 1745; cf. *BHS; BHK; GK,* §55g; B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* (⁵1968), 209; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 80; H. W. Hoffmann, *Der Intention der Verkündigung Jesajas. BZAW* 136 (1974), 51-52.

תְּמוֹל *t^emôl;* אֶתְמוֹל *'eṯmôl;* אֶתְמוּל *'eṯmûl;* אִתְּמוֹל *'itt^emôl*

I. Etymology. II. Usage: 1. General; 2. Individual Occurrences. III. LXX.

I. Etymology. Heb. *tml* is cognate with Akk. *timāli/u,*[1] Eth. *tĕālĕ,*[2] Syr. *'ĕtmāl(î),*[3] and Jewish Aram. *t^emālî/ê.*[4]

II. Usage.

1. *General.* In the OT *t^emôl/ōl* occurs 23 times, *'eṯmôl* 5 times(1 S. 4:7; 14:21; 19:7; 2 S. 5:2; Ps. 90:4), *'eṯmûl* twice (Isa. 30:33; Mic. 2:8), and *'itt^emôl* once (1 S. 10:11), for a total of 31 occurrences of the lexeme. In the majority of instances (24 times), *t^emôl/'eṯmôl/'itt^emôl* appears in conjunction with *šilšô/ōm,*[5] "the day before yesterday," which appears independently only in Prov. 22:20 *(K).*

2. *Individual Occurrences.* a. *With hayyôm.* When used in combination with *hayyôm,* "today," *t^emôl* means "yesterday." For example, in Ex. 5:14b the Egyptian taskmasters beat the Israelite supervisors and ask: "Why did you not finish your quota as before[6] — both yesterday and today?" When David has absented himself from Saul's table for two days, Saul asks: "Why did the son of Jesse not come to the feast — both yesterday and today?" (1 S. 20:27bβ). And David says to Ittai: "You came only yesterday — and shall I (already) today make you wander about with us?" (2 S. 15:20aα).

b. *With šilšôm.* (1) The expression *t^emôl/'eṯmôl šilšôm* means "previously, up to now." Pharaoh commands the taskmasters to require of the Israelites the same quantity of bricks as they had made previously (Ex. 5:8a). Upon hearing that the ark has come into the Israelite camp, the Philistines cry out: "Woe to us! Nothing like this has happened to us before!" (1 S. 4:7b). Boaz says to Ruth: "You came to a people that you did not know before" (Ruth 2:11b).

The idiom *gam-t^emôl/'eṯmôl gam-šilšôm* means "for some time past," as in 2 S. 3:17b, where Abner says to the elders of Israel: "For some time past you have been wanting David to be king over you," and in 1 S. 5:2//1 Ch. 11:2, where the tribes of Israel remind David in Hebron: "For some time, while Saul was king over us, it was you who led Israel out and brought it in."

---

t^emôl. G. Gerleman, "'Heute,' 'Gestern' und 'Morgen' im Hebräischen," *Teologinen aikakauskirja Helsinki* 72 (1967) 84-89.

1. *AHw,* III, 1359-60.
2. *LexLingAeth,* 555.
3. *LexSyr,* 827.
4. *ANH*³, 44; Jastrow, 1677.
5. → שָׁלֹשׁ *šālōš,* II.3.b.
6. See II.2.b.(2) below.

The noun *tᵉmûnâ* occurs in both versions of the Decalog (Ex. 20:4; Dt. 5:8); there are also 5 occurrences in Dt. 4, which in its final form is a parenesis on the prohibition of images. Here it appears commonly in connection with or in parallel with *pesel* (Ex. 20:4; Dt. 4:16,23,25; 5:8).[11] In Nu. 12:8 and Job 4:16 we find *mar'eh* associated with *tᵉmûnâ;* in Num. 12:8 *mar'eh* may be considered a late addition.[12] The only remaining occurrence is in Ps. 17:15.

In all instances the meaning is "visible form." Several lexicons make a distinction between form as "appearance" and as "a created likeness" or the like,[13] but this distinction cannot be sustained semantically. Dohmen has shown that the "basis for this differentiation" is to be found in the different construction of *tᵉmûnâ* employed by the two versions of the Decalog; this difference was further emphasized by the LXX, which uses *homoíōma* to translate *tᵉmûnâ* in the context of the prohibition of images, a relational term it uses elsewhere to translate *dᵉmûṯ* and *taḇnîṯ*.[14] This usage introduces the semantic relationship of a "likeness" to an "original," which *tᵉmûnâ* nowhere possesses.[15]

2. *Prohibition of Images.* In both texts prohibiting images, *tᵉmûnâ* serves to qualify the meaning of *pesel,* with this difference: in Dt. 5:8 *tᵉmûnâ* must be understood in apposition to *pesel,* whereas in Ex. 20:4 the presence of the copula means that it must be understood as a synonym of *pesel* and thus as a separate object. This distinction should not be blurred by conforming the text in Deuteronomy to that in Exodus,[16] because here we have evidence that Deuteronomy preserves the original version, which treats the prohibition of images as an interpretation of the first commandment. The text that follows reads: "you shall not bow down to them and worship them" (Ex. 20:5//Dt. 5:9). In Deuteronomy the plural suffixes must refer to *'ᵉlōhîm 'ᵃḥērîm* (v. 7),[17] preceding the prohibition of images; in Exodus they can easily be interpreted as referring to *pesel wᵉḵol-tᵉmûnâ* and thus to the images themselves.[18]

In this context *pesel* denotes an idol manufactured by an artisan.[19] Here *tᵉmûnâ* does not denote a different form of image, such as one made of cast metal; instead *kol-tᵉmûnâ* extends the prohibition *(lō'-ta'ᵃśeh-lᵉḵā)* to the making of any visible form whatever. This total exclusion is amplified by the reference to the tripartite three-dimensional world: "anything in heaven above, or on the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth."

Dohmen has shown that the expansion of the prohibition by the addition *kol-tᵉmûnâ*

---

11. → פסל *psl.*
12. *BHK, BHS;* also G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 131, for Job 4:16.
13. E.g., *GesB,* 881.
14. P. 217.
15. Dohmen, 217-18, 220.
16. *BHS;* see the comms. in loc.
17. Zimmerli, 236-38.
18. Hossfeld, 23-24; Dohmen, 215-16.
19. → XII, 33.

brew (Sir. 3). There are 11 occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as Jewish Aramaic (paal), "support, seize, hold."[7]

II. Meaning. With only one exception, *tmk* is found only in the qal. With an accusative object, it means "grasp" or "hold," with the prep. *b*ᵉ or *k*ᵉ, "hold onto, uphold." The niphal (only Prov. 5:22) means "be held fast." Synonyms appearing in parallel are → אמץ *'mṣ* piel, "strengthen," and → עזר *'zr*, "help" (Isa. 41:10), → נצב *nṣb* hiphil, "set, place" (Ps. 41:13[Eng. 12]), → דבק *dbq*, "cling to" (Ps. 63:9[8]), → חזק *ḥzq* hiphil, "hold fast" (Prov. 3:18), → שׁלח *šlḥ* piel, "stretch forth" (Prov. 31:19), → לכד *lkd*, "catch" (Prov. 5:22), and → מוט *mwṭ*, "(not) totter" (Ps. 17:5).

III. Statistics. Of the 21 occurrences of *tmk*, 10 are in sapiential texts (1 in Job, 9 in Proverbs); Sirach has 2 additional occurrences. We may therefore consider the verb a favored term of wisdom literature. Cultic language is suggested by the 4 occurrences in the Psalms, the 2 in Deutero-Isaiah, and Isa. 33:15 (entrance *tôrâ*). The writing prophets have only 2 occurrences, both in the idiom *tômēk šebeṭ*, "scepter bearer," lit. "the one who holds the scepter" (Am. 1:5,8). The verb is rare in narrative, appearing only in contexts with religious overtones (Gen. 48:17; Ex. 17:12). None of the occurrences should be eliminated as an instance of textual corruption; the abnormal qal ptcp. *tômîk* in Ps. 16:5 probably goes back to an incorrect plene writing of the ptcp. *tômēk*.[8]

IV. Usage. The vb. *tmk*, "grasp, hold," can be used with both concrete and abstract objects.

1. *Concrete Objects.* The most common object (as already in the Kilamuwa inscription)[9] is the hand *(yāḏ)*. Joseph "grasped" his father's right hand (the hand used to give a blessing) to shift it from the head of his second son, Ephraim, to that of his first son, Manasseh (Gen. 48:17). Aaron and Hur "held up" the hands of Moses raised in supplication during the battle with the Amalekites, so as to support and maintain the gesture of prayer (Ex. 17:12). The hands of the capable wife hold the spindle (*pelek*, Prov. 31:19).

The ptcp. *tômēk* with the obj. *šebeṭ* can be used as the title "scepter bearer" (Am. 1:5,8), a periphrastic term for a king or prince. This idiom (of which Amos may have been fond) corresponds to Middle Bab. *ta-me-eḫ ḫaṭṭi*;[10] cf. also *twmk mlmd*, "one who handles the plow, plowman," in Sir. 38:25.

In Prov. 28:17 the meaning of *tmk* is unclear. It is used in a kind of vetitive comment *('al-yiṯmᵉkû-ḇô)* on the statement: "A man burdened by bloodguilt will be a fugitive to

7. *WTM*, IV, 651; cf. Jastrow, 1677.

8. *GK*, §50e.

9. See I above.

10. *AHw*, III, 1312.

In v. 5a the psalmist calls Yahweh his "chosen portion" *(m^e^nāṯ-ḥelqî)* and his "cup" *(kôsî);* it is Yahweh (emphasized by *'attâ,* "you") who "holds my lot *(gôrālî),*" i.e., "determines" it.[31] Kraus accurately conveys the meaning: "You are he who establishes my lot."[32]

According to the MT of Ps. 17:5, the inf. abs. *tāmôk̲* is used as an imperative addressed to Yahweh: "Hold fast my steps in your paths."[33] But such a prayer for God's help in leading a moral life does not really fit the context, which expressly emphasizes the psalmist's upright way of life (vv. 3-4). The common emendation of the infinitive absolute to a finite form *tāmak̲* or *tām^e^k̲û* is preferable: "My steps have held fast to your paths,"[34] a declaration of innocence. Kraus reads v. 5 in combination with v. 4: "From the ways of the robber my steps have desisted" *('orḥōṯ pārîṣ* as the object of a conjectural *mē'orḥōṯ),* but this interpretation is not consonant with the semantics of *tmk.*[35] Ps. 17:5 contrasts with Prov. 5:5 *(tmk).* Since *ma'gāl,* "path," is one of the favorite terms of later wisdom (Prov. 2:9,15,18; 4:11,26; 5:6,21), Ps. 17:5 might suggest a *tôrâ*-oriented redaction. The occurrences of *tmk* in the Psalter with God as subject (Ps. 16:5; 41:13[12]; 63:9[8]) thus have their setting in the speaker's expressions of confidence, while Ps. 17:5 (cj.: *tāmak̲/tām^e^k̲û*) probably points to a *tôrâ*-oriented sapiential redactor.

The two occurrences in Deutero-Isaiah also appear in expressions of trust. In an oracle of salvation addressed to Israel (Isa. 41:8-13) that is typical of Deutero-Isaiah, Yahweh's intervention on Israel's behalf is described in three verbal clauses: "I strengthened you *('mṣ),* I helped you *('zr),* I grasped you [*tmk* with acc. obj.] with my victorious right hand" (v. 10b). Since Yahweh has grasped Israel with his victorious right hand and now holds Israel firmly, Israel shares in Yahweh's ineluctable triumph.

In Isa. 42:1 *tmk* (here with the prep. *b^e^*) has a different sense. According to Elliger, the context is an autobiographical "presentation oracle, an ex post facto confirmation of the prophet's call."[36] In v. 1 Yahweh takes his servant *('ab̲dî)* by the hand (*tmk* impf.) in the presence of the heavenly council. If the verb meant "hold,"[37] we would expect the perfect tense (resultative). But Elliger's interpretation is substantially correct: "The gesture of taking the servant's hand and probably continuing to hold it during the entire speech that follows (has) a deeper significance . . . : it validates the appointment of the servant and brings it to an affirmative conclusion."

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In contrast to the Psalms, in the Dead Sea Scrolls *tmk* appears exclusively with human subjects. In 1QH the speaker (the Teacher of Righteousness?) holds fast to the covenant of the Lord (*btwmky bbrytkh,* 2:21), the Lord himself (*bkh,*

31. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁴1926); *HAL,* II, 1751.
32. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. tr. 1988), 233.
33. *HAL,* II, 1751.
34. *BHK; BHS;* cf. NRSV.
35. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 243-44.
36. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 201.
37. Ibid., 203.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *tmm* with the basic meaning "come or bring to an end" is found in several Semitic languages: Ugar. *tmm, tm,* "be finished";[1] Phoen.-Pun. *tm,* "entirety, whole," *tmm,* "become solid, make ready";[2] Arab. *tamma;*[3] Aram./Syr. *tm, tmym, tom,* etc., "be complete, whole."[4] We also find Egyp. *tm* with a range of meanings similar to that in Hebrew, embracing antithetical notions.[5]

2. *Occurrences.* The OT contains more than 200 instances of forms derived from the root *tmm:* 64 occurrences of verbal forms (qal 54, including 20 of the inf. *tōm;* hiphil 8; hithpael 2), 32 of abstract nouns (*tōm* 23, *tummâ* 5, *m^e^ṯōm* 4), and 106 of nominalized adjectives (*tāmîm* 91, *tām* 15). Because of textual uncertainties,[6] this count cannot claim absolute precision. The form *tām* (fem. *tammâ*), a primary adjective deriving by haplology from **tamm,* is probably earlier than the *qaṭîl* form *tāmîm,* which became common later.[7]

The form *tōm* comes from two originally distinct grammatical forms and accordingly has two different functions: on the one hand, it represents the infinitive (from **quṭul*[8]); on the other, an abstract noun (from **qull/quṭl*[9]). The context determines its function in each instance,[10] e.g., the infinitive with verbal suffix *tummām* (Dt. 2:15; cf. *hiššām^e^ḏām* in 7:23) in contrast to the abstract *tummî* (Ps. 7:9[Eng. 8], in parallel with *ṣiḏqî*). It is noteworthy that each of the two grammatical categories is associated with a distinct semantic domain: with very few exceptions, the verbal forms denote the observable fact that something has come or been brought to an end (often with negative connotations), whereas the noun and adjective (apart from the cultic term *tāmîm* describing a sacrificial animal as "unblemished") belong to the psychological and moral realm and refer to the positive attribute of "uprightness." This observation explains why the nominal forms appear primarily in wisdom literature and texts influenced by it.

What Were They?" *VT* 14 (1964) 67-74; M. Rothenberg, "Meaning of *tām,*" *BethM* 30 (1984/85) 441; R. B. Y. Scott, "Wise and Foolish, Righteous and Wicked," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972), 146-65; F. L. Shults, "*šlm* and *tmm* in Biblical Hebrew" (diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1974); J. Tropper, "*Tmym 'm YHWH* 'vollkommen vor dem Herrn,'" *UF* 19 (1987) 295-300; N. H. Tur-Sinai, "*'ûrîm w^e^ṯummîm,*" *EMiqr,* I, 179-83; C. Van Dam, "Urim and Thummin" (diss., Kampen, 1986).

→ כלה *kālâ.*

1. *UT,* no. 2563; *WUS,* no. 2770.
2. *DISO,* 329, 331; *KAI,* III, 26, 52.
3. Wehr, 97.
4. *LexSyr,* 826-27; *ANH*³, 444; F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 221; Jastrow, 1653, 1674-75, 1677-78.
5. *WbÄS,* V, 301-5; D. Meeks, *Année lexicographique* (Paris, 1980/81), I, 418; II, 414; see III.1 below.
6. See below.
7. *BLe,* §61y, nα; but cf. *VG,* I, 260.
8. *BLe,* §58o.
9. *BLe,* §61h′, i″.
10. Contra *HAL,* II, 1753.

Certain forms involve textual problems.[11] Ex. 26:24 and 36:29: *tammîm*, "complete (?)," could come from *t'm* ("double"). Jgs. 20:48: *mᵉṯōm*, "undamaged (?) (city)," should probably be read as *mᵉṯîm*, "people" (cf. Dt. 2:34). In 1 S. 14:41, with LXX, *tāmîm* ("justice") should be emended to the oracular *tummîm*.[12] The transitive use of *tummî*, "I make an end," in Jer. 27:8 is unusual; the Syriac and Tg. read *tittî*. In Nu. 17:28(13); Jer. 44:18; Lam. 3:22, the form *tamnû*, "we are finished," instead of *tammônû*, is irregular (Ps. 64:7[6] = *tāmᵉnû*, "they conceal" [?]). The form *'êṯām*, "I shall be blameless," in Ps. 19:14(13) is a late plene spelling. In the case of *m'štm* (Jer. 6:29; cf. Vg. *in igne consumptum est* and NRSV) and *lmwtm* (Ps. 73:4),[13] redivision yields the word *tām*. In Dnl. 9:24 *Q lᵉhāṯēm*, "put an end to," is preferable to *K lḥtm*, "seal." Finally, there are variations in the vocalization of the form *tm:* in Ps. 37:37, where the MT has *tām*, the versions read *tōm;* the reverse is true in Prov. 10:29 and 13:6.

3. *LXX, Vg.* The LXX usually translates verbal forms of *tmm* with *ekleípein*, "fail to appear, cease," which can convey both the neutral and the negative meanings of the root: compare such expressions as "does the roster of boys end here?" (1 S. 16:11) and "the money is gone" (Gen. 47:15,18) with "let sinners perish" (Ps. 104[103]:35) and "until they are destroyed" (Jer. 24:10). The phrase *héōs eis télos*, "until their end" (*télos* being able to mean both "completion" and "death"), also permits the translators to capture the ambivalence of *tmm*, as when Moses finishes writing down or reciting the law (Dt. 31:24,30) or the enemy is utterly destroyed (Josh. 8:24; 10:20).

The foreboding connotation is sometimes brought out more sharply by *(ex)analískein*, "destroy" (Nu. 14:33,35; 32:13). Once (Gen. 47:18) we find *exérchesthai*, "go out, go past," which expresses neutrally the passing of a period of time; another text (Job 22:3) uses *haploún*, "make simple,"[14] to speak approvingly of a humble way of life.

For the subst. form *tāmîm (tām)* with its positive connotation, the LXX generally uses forms with an alpha privative. The adj. *ámōnos*, "without blemish" (ca. 50 instances) — supported by Lev. 22:21: "(the sacrificial animal) must be perfect [Gk. *ámōnos*]; it shall have no blemish [*mᵉ'um;* Gk. *mṓnos*]" — can also denote moral blamelessness. Other, less common, privative forms refer only to the latter and appear primarily in theological texts that deal with ethical conduct (Psalms, Job, Proverbs): *ákakos*, "innocent" (ca. 15 instances); *ámemptos*, "blameless";[15] *athṓos*, "not subject to prosecution." Among the nonprivative forms, the most common is *téleios* (7 times), which means "perfect" in both the physical and the moral sense; others include *hósios*, "devout" (5 times), *katharós*, "pure" (bis), *díkaios*, "righteous," and *alēthinós*, "true." All these translations emphasize various nuances of the Hebrew root.

---

11. See *BHS* and comms.
12. See IV.2 below.
13. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. tr. 1989), 83.
14. O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT*, I, 386.
15. W. Grundmann, *TDNT*, IV, 572.

"when the blossom is over." The Vg. translates Jer. 6:29 as *consumptus est* (cf. NRSV).[24] A heifer to be used in the ancient purification ceremony must be "red *t^emîmâ*" (Nu. 19:2). The Hebrew word echoes the universal requirement that a sacrificial animal be without blemish,[25] but the ancient interpreters (Midr. *Sifre* and Rashi) understand it as an adverb modifying the color: "totally red."

A message is delivered in its entirety: the words of the law are written down and the words of a song are recited "to the very end" (*ʿaḏ tummām,* Dt. 31:24,30); the words of a speaker are "ended" (*tammû,* Job 31:40). Here we already note a situational difference: completion of the writing leaves a written text, while a concluded speech is no longer physically present. When instructions are carried out completely, they are past and gone: Josh. 4:10 says that the priests and people did all that Yahweh commanded through Joshua "until everything was finished" *(ʿaḏ tōm).* A period of time that has elapsed totally belongs to the past and is gone forever: "a whole *(tāmîm)* day" (Josh. 10:13), "a full *(t^emîmâ)* year" (Lev. 25:30), "seven full *(t^emîmōṯ)* weeks" (23:15), "until the end *(ʿaḏ-tōm)* of the year" (25:29; Jer. 1:3). The expression "your years come to an end *(yittāmmû)*" refers to death (Ps. 102:28[27]).

Thus the root *tmm,* which is inherently ambiguous, simply denoting an absolute conclusion, gives rise to a well-developed semantic dichotomy. Around one pole are grouped the positive senses of perfection and completion, while around the other are gathered the antonymic senses of cessation, decline, and total destruction.

This fundamental polarity of "finish up/finish off" has many parallels in a wide range of other languages, e.g., Akk. *gamāru,* Aram. and Middle Heb. *gmr,* Gk. *teleután,* Lat. *conficere,* Ger. *vollenden/verenden.*

When interpreting a text that uses the root *tmm,* it is necessary to determine the dominant semantic component suggested by the immediate context; but it is also necessary to note the reactive emotional response evoked by the situational conditions of the entire text. The syntagm of *tmm* followed by an infinitive is particularly informative in this regard. For example, when it is reported that the entire nation crossed the Jordan, the Hebrew says lit.: "until [they] had come to an end *(tammû)* of crossing" (Josh. 3:17; 4:1,11) or "until (their) end *(ʿaḏ-tōm)* . . . of crossing" (Josh. 5:6; 2 S. 15:24). The statement that records the passing of an entire generation reads: "when [they] had come to an end . . . of dying off" (Dt. 2:16). The demise (*hmm,* Dt. 2:15) of all those who had sinned against Yahweh and the slaughter (*npl,* Josh. 8:24; *nkh,* 10:2) of all the enemy are described by the words "until their end" *(ʿaḏ-tummām).*

The verbal forms of *tmm* might appear simply to indicate that the specific predicate that follows applies to the totality of the group, and that the distinction between objective statement in some cases and negative connotation in others must be made on the basis of that predicate. Closer examination, however, shows that *tmm* conveys the negative aspect of shrinkage and final disappearance even in texts with no emotional overtones. The group that undertakes to cross the river keeps shrinking until it is finally

24. See M. Dahood, *Bibl* 44 (1963) 298.
25. See IV.1 below.

object.[26] With some difficulty, the words "as one burns up dung until it is all gone *(ʿaḏ-tummô)*" in 1 K. 14:10 may be interpreted as "until it is clean" (Vg. *usque ad purum*).

The finite verb forms are also closely related to words that denote passing away and death,[27] and can stand pleonastically alongside them. The godless "will perish, they will be swept away *(tammû)* utterly by terrors" (Ps. 73:19); "are we all to end *(tamnû)* in dying?" (Nu. 17:28[13]). Finally, the vb. *tmm* by itself can take on this semantic function: "by sword and famine those prophets will be consumed *(yittammû)*" (Jer. 14:15); "they will suffer the same fate as the whole multitude of Israel that have perished *(tammû)*" (2 K. 7:13).

The same sense is conveyed by certain texts that present text-critical or grammatical problems:[28] "the enemy, they have vanished *(tammû)*" (Ps. 9:7[6]); "we have not perished *(lōʾ-tamnû)*" (Lam. 3:22; cf. Vg.: *non sumus consumpti*).[29]

When something bad comes to an end, it is good news. The use of *tmm* in such cases lends a note of comfort to the verb. "I will purge your filthiness out of you," Yahweh promises, albeit in conjunction with a threat (Ezk. 22:15). The rust encrusting a kettle, a symbol of Jerusalem's bloodguilt, "will melt away" (*tittum* [= *tittōm*], Ezk. 24:11). "Marauders vanish *(tammû)* from the land" (Isa. 16:5), "the wicked vanish *(yittammû)* from the earth" (Ps. 104:35), "your guilt, O daughter Zion, is removed *(tam)*" (Lam. 4:22).

3. *Positive Sense.* The positive pole of the root *tmm* appears with great frequency, but almost all the occurrences are in the realm of moral and ethical assessment.[30] There are, however, a few instances of concrete usage. The noun *meṯōm*[31] denotes a "healthy, uninjured part of the body" (Isa. 1:6; Ps. 38:4,8[3,7]).[32] Job 21:23-26 contrasts the opposite fates of human beings: one, wholly at ease and secure, "dies in full prosperity *(tummô)*"; another dies embittered, never having tasted any enjoyment. Here *tōm* clearly denotes physical well-being and material prosperity. Sinners plot acts of violence (Prov. 1:11-13): they lie in wait for the innocent; they devour the living like Sheol, and "the healthy *(temîmîm)* like those who go down into the Pit" (the parallelism suggests "healthy," but "innocent" is also possible). As an expression of his love, the youth calls his beloved "my dove, my faultless one *(tammāṯî)*" (Cant. 5:2; 6:9), extolling her as pure and virginal. Twice, with reference to knowledge, *tāmîm* means "all-encompassing": *temîm dēʿôṯ* (Job 36:4), *temîm dēʿîm* (37:4). In both instances this term for "omniscience" probably refers to God (36:4b anticipates v. 5[33]).

The texts of 2 S. 20:18 and Ps. 64:7(6) are difficult or corrupt. The Samuel passage appears to suggest the settling of a dispute: it was customary to inquire at Abel and

26. Cf. *BHS.*
27. See above.
28. See comms.
29. But see *BHS.*
30. See IV.3 below.
31. On the form see *BLe,* §61dη.
32. On Jgs. 20:48 see I.2 above.
33. Ibn Ezra, contrary to most comms.

Some texts (such as 2 S. 2:1), however, suggest that the oracle simply was asked for a yes or no answer, like Akk. *anna û ulla* ("yes or no"), as the judgment of God. This evidence has led to attempts to find antithetical meanings in the two words, e.g., *'ûrîm,* "guilt" (as the "illumination" of guilt, or by association with *'rr,* "curse"), vs. *tummîm,* "blamelessness, innocence"; or, with the opposite polarity, *'ûrîm,* "light, life," vs. *tummîm,* "end, death."

3. *Religious and Ethical Realm.* Generally, however, the derivatives of *tmm* (mostly nouns) denote an attitude or action found to be praiseworthy. The predominant use of the root in the realm of morality and ethics is due to the particular nature of the OT documents (esp. Psalms, Proverbs, and Job) and by no means indicates that this is the original meaning of the forms in question. On the contrary, it is safe to assume that even here the concrete sense is earlier, even though the language of the Bible furnishes only a few examples.[37] (There is no need for the unconvincing theory that "*tāmîm,* 'complete, undamaged' [as applied to moral and religious conduct], must have derived from the language of sacrifice."[38])

The distribution of the homonymous pairs *tām/tāmîm* and *tōm/tummâ* differs significantly. The less common *tām* occurs hardly at all in Psalms and Proverbs (twice and once, respectively) but is more frequent in Job (7 times, albeit with 3 appearing together in 9:20-22); in Genesis, J uses *tām* (25:27) and P uses *tāmîm* (6:9; 17:1). The noun *tōm* occurs 23 times; the less frequent *tummâ* occurs only once in Proverbs (11:3) but 4 times in Job (2:3,9; 27:5; 31:6). The semantic nuances by no means parallel this distribution, but are reflected equally in all four forms, which are clearly interchangeable in similar contexts.

The Hebrew notion that an action or way of life is "complete" or "integral" refers in the first instance to a coincidence of thought, word, and deed that itself harmonizes with the norms governing the life of the human community. It suggests neither sinlessness nor particularistic obedience to a specific legal system. Religious parenesis and sapiential pedagogy tend to stress an absolute polarity of two ways of life, one right and the other wrong. The word group *tmm* denotes conduct that is right, benign, upstanding, and just, whether expressed in a single act or in a general way of life.

The foreign king Abimelech sent and took Abraham's wife. But because he acted in good faith, believing that she was Abraham's sister, he is not held guilty: he is innocent *(ṣaddîq),* he insists later (Gen. 20:4-5), for "I did this in the integrity of my heart *(beṯom-leḇāḇî)* and the innocence of my hands." God confirms this verdict: "you did this in the integrity of your heart" (v. 6). Absalom began the revolt against his father, King David, by convoking an assembly in Hebron, to which he also invited leading figures from Jerusalem. They knew nothing of his treasonable plans and accepted the invitation "in full innocence" (*leṯummām,* 2 S. 15:11). Even the enemy bowman who mortally wounds the king of Israel does so "quite unwittingly" (*leṯummô,* 1 K. 22:34//

37. See III.3 above.

38. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT. OTL,* 2 vols. (Eng. tr. 1961-67), II, 394.

2 Ch. 18:33), since he did not recognize the king in his disguise and therefore hit him by accident. In his contention with God, Job declares that he is "innocent" (*tām,* Job 9:21), but acknowledges that God can prove even the "blameless" *(tām)* to be "perverse" (*'qš,* v. 20), since God destroys both "the blameless *(tām)* and the wicked *(rāšā')*" (v. 22). Job's friends, however, are convinced that God never rejects someone who is "devout" (*tām,* 8:20). In 9:20-22 *tām* in the sense of "innocent" appears to refer only to a status in a legal dispute; in 8:20, however, the verb refers to someone who lives a devout life.

Among the participants in a public legal action, Amos speaks of a "dispenser of justice" *(môḵîaḥ)* and a *dōḇēr tāmîm* (Am. 5:10). The latter expression is sometimes treated as a construct phrase and interpreted as "speaker (advocate) for the innocent."[39] But the analogy of *hōlēḵ tāmîm,* "one who walks with integrity,"[40] suggests instead the translation "one who speaks with integrity," a witness whose statements match the truth.

Naturally the judgment of a biblical author often reflects a subjective standard. Jacob, who — unlike the wild, nomadic Esau — remains in his tents, is "a good-natured man" (*'îš tām,* Gen. 25:27). Abraham is to walk before Yahweh and be "blameless" (*tāmîm,* 17:1). In the introductory verses of the book of Job, the narrator describes Job as a man "blameless *(tām)* and upright, who feared God and turned away from evil" (Job 1:1); he has God confirm this description (v. 8). In the story of the deluge, Noah is described as "a righteous man, blameless in his generation" (Gen. 6:9). At first glance, the expression *ṣaddîq tāmîm* ("a perfectly righteous man"?) appears pleonastic; but the disjunctive accent suggests a better interpretation: "Noah, a devout man, was blameless in his generation" (cf. Sir. 44:17). In Job's lament, however, the same sequence of words can be understood as a rhetorical pleonasm: he, Job, has become a laughingstock, though he is "a perfectly righteous man" (*ṣaddîq tāmîm,* Job 12:4).

The use of the term to characterize a way of life can be observed in the use of the word group in conjunction with the words for "walk" and "path" or "way." Derivatives of *tmm* appear in syntagms with *hlk* qal (1 K. 9:4; Ps. 15:2; 26:1,11; 84:12[11]; 101:6; Prov. 2:7; 10:9; 28:6,18) and hithpael (Gen. 17:1; Ps. 101:2; Prov. 20:7) as well as *dereḵ* (2 S. 22:33 = Ps. 18:33[32]; Ezk. 28:15; Ps. 101:2,6; 119:1; Prov. 10:29; 11:5,20; 13:6; 19:1; 28:6; Job 4:6; 22:3).

In the syntagm *hôlēḵ tāmîm* (Ps. 15:2; Prov. 28:18), our word functions as an adverbial accusative with *hôlēḵ,* describing not an attribute of the subject but rather the nature of the subject's conduct, as is shown by the analogous expression *hôlᵉḵîm bᵉṯāmîm* in Ps. 84:12(11). The expression *dereḵ tāmîm* in Ps. 101:2,6 is harder to decipher. It could mean "the way of one who is guileless";[41] probably, however, *tāmîm* is an adjective modifying *dereḵ:* "the right way" (cf. *dereḵ yāšār,* "the straight way," in Prov. 14:12). In any case, the conceptual association of a guileless individual with the corre-

39. K. Marti, *Dodekapropheten. KHC* XIII (1904), 192.

40. See below.

41. Rashi; cf. Buber: "the way of the forthright."

*תַּן *tan

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Meaning: 1. Jackal; 2. Owl. IV. Ancient Near East. V. Usage. VI. LXX.

I. Etymology. The etymology of the noun is obscure. The lexeme is apparently not found in non-Biblical Hebrew or the other Semitic languages (including the Dead Sea Scrolls) as the name of an animal or as a noun. Only in Modern Hebrew does it reappear with the meaning "jackal." The single occurrence in the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions (*ḏ tn*, "lord of the jackals")[1] is very uncertain in regard to both reading and interpretation.[2] A derivation from the verbal root *tnh* has often been proposed.[3] The only certain occurrences of this verb are the piel forms in Jgs. 5:11 and 11:40, with the meaning "celebrate"; the occurrences in Hos. 8:9-10 and Ps. 8:2(Eng. 1), with a different meaning, are highly uncertain.[4] If this derivation is correct, the noun **tan* would refer to the cry of an animal, which — with a narrow focus on Jgs. 11:40 — would have a mournful sound. Alternatively, the noun might derive from a vb. **tnn,* meaning either "stretch out,"[5] "be strong, powerful, secure" (on the basis of a hypothetical relationship with Assyr. *danānu*),[6] or (synonymous

**tan.* Y. Aharoni, "On Some Animals Mentioned in the Bible," *Osiris* 5 (1938) 461-78; W. Barta, "Schakal," *LexÄg,* V, 526-28; F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden, 1960), esp. 44, 100; A. Brehm, *Brehms Tierleben,* ed. O. zur Strassen. Säugetiere 3 (Leipzig, [4]1915), esp. 195-201; G. Cansdale, *Animals of Bible Lands* (Exeter, 1970), esp. 124-27; G. R. Driver, "Birds in the OT," *PEQ* 87 (1955) 5-20, 129-40; Y. Feliks, "Jackal," *EncJud,* IX, 1189; idem, *Nature and Man in the Bible* (London, 1981), esp. 101-4; idem and B. Reicke, "Schakal," *BHHW,* III, 1682-83; H. Gossen and A. Steier, "Schakal," *PW,* IIA/1 (1921), 399-401; B. Janowski, U. Neumann-Gorsolke, and U. Glessmer, eds., *Gefährten und Feinde des Menschen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1993); H. Kaupel, "'Sirenen' in der Septuaginta," *BZ* 23 (1935/36) 158-65; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (Göttingen, 1984), esp. 147; O. Margalith, "Samson's Foxes," *VT* 35 (1985) 224-29; V. Møller-Christensen and K. E. J. Jørgensen, *Biblisches Tierlexikon* (Constance, 1969), esp. 30, 90-92; H.-P. Müller, "Die Funktion divinatorischen Redens und die Tierbezeichnungen der Inschrift von *Tell Deir 'Allā,*" in J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, eds., *Balaam Text from* Deir ʿAllā *Re-evaluated* (Leiden, 1992), 185-205; D. Müller-Using and B. Grzimek, "Schakale," in B. Grzimek, ed., *Grzimeks Tierleben,* XII, 3 (Zurich, 1972), 237-43; C. Naaktgeboren and B. Grzimek, "Schakale," in B. Grzimek, ed., *Grzimeks Enzyklopädie.* Säugetiere 4 (Zurich, 1987), 107-14.

1. No. 353, 2; W. F. Albright, *Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment. HTS* 22 (1966), 21-22, 44, esp. 22.

2. B. Sass, *The Genesis of the Alphabet and Its Development in the Second Millennium B.C. ÄAT* 13 (1988), 23-25, esp. 24.

3. E.g., Feliks, *Nature,* 103.

4. *HAL,* II, 1759-60.

5. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches Schulwörterbuch* (1842), cited by K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 356.

6. *GesB,* 884.

with tnh[7]) "lament, howl."[8] The first meaning would refer to the jackal's long, thin body, the last (like the derivation from tnh) to its mournful howl. But the existence of a vb. tnn (esp. with the meanings cited) is totally unproven. The only possible epigraphic occurrences, in Lachish Letter 3:12, is still disputed.[9] There is also room for doubt whether a long, thin body is characteristic of the jackal, suggesting a connection with the meaning "be stretched out." In sum, it is best to treat *tan as a primary noun.[10]

II. Occurrences. The noun occurs 14 times, always in the plural: Isa. 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer. 9:10(11); 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; Mic. 1:8; Mal. 1:3; Ps. 44:20(19); Job 30:29; Lam. 4:3. In Ezk. 29:3 and 32:2, the grapheme *tannîm* should either be emended to *tannîn,* with some textual support, or be interpreted as a by-form (possibly ad hoc) of *tannîn,*[11] since the creature referred to is clearly a crocodile. Possibly the contrastive notion of a dry and desolate land in 29:5 and 32:4 or the special role of the jackal in Egyptian religion helped suggest "jackal" as a title for Pharaoh.[12]

Once, in Lam. 4:3, the pl. form *tannîn* stands for *tannîm (Q).* This is probably an aramaizing plural.[13] The unique feminine plural in Mal. 1:3b "arouses suspicion":[14] *wā'āśîm 'eṯ-hārāyw šᵉmāmâ wᵉ'eṯ-naḥᵃlāṯô lᵉṯannōṯ miḏbār.* Since the second half of the parallelism also lacks a verb and the LXX translates the text as *kaí étaxa tá hória autoú eis aphanismón kaí tḗn klēronomían autoú eis dómata erḗmou,* scholars generally emend *lᵉṯannōṯ* to *nāṯattî*[15] or assume that LXX *eis dómata* represents *linwôṯ* or *nᵉwôṯ.*[16] Even though the vb. *'āśîm* can govern both accusatives and the MT makes sense without emendation,[17] the feminine plural and the construct phrase with *miḏbār* are unusual (cf. *nᵉ'ôṯ miḏbār* in Jer. 9:9[10]; 23:10; Joel 1:19,20; 2:22; Ps. 65:13[12]).

III. Meaning. A few preliminary remarks are in order before we consider the meaning of the lexeme. Semitic lexicography often confronts the problem that ancient Near Eastern animal names are not correlated with the Linnean taxonomy. The required monovalence of the various lexemes simply does not exist, since many of the terms

---

7. See above.

8. König, 549-50; *BDB,* 1072.

9. J. Renz and W. Röllig, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik,* I (Darmstadt, 1995), 412-19, esp. 418; on the Aramaic root *tnn,* "smoke," see Beyer, Erg., 430.

10. *HAL,* II, 1759.

11. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 106.

12. Barta.

13. *GesTh,* 1511; *GK,* §87e; JM, §90c; Wagner, 134-35.

14. J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin, ⁴1963), 204.

15. K. Elliger, *Zwölf Kleinen Propheten II. ATD* XXV (⁶1967), 190; T. Lescow, *ZAW* 102 (1990) 197, who also considers v. 3b to be secondary.

16. Following L. Capellus, *Commentarii et Notae Criticae* (Amsterdam, 1689); cf. G. J. Botterweck, *BiLe* 1 (1960) 31: "So I made its mountains a desert and its heritage pastures of the steppe."

17. And is therefore retained by P. A. Verhoef, *Haggai and Malachi. NICOT* (1987), 203; H. Graf Reventlow, *Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi. ATD* XXV/2 (⁹1993), 133, 136.

have a very broad semantic potential; conversely, several lexemes may represent a single zoological category.[18] Furthermore, the meaning of quite a few names of flora and fauna is largely or totally unknown.[19] This is true particularly in the case of lexemes whose context and etymology provide no clue as to their taxonomic identification or that, like **tan,* appear only in Biblical Hebrew and therefore cannot be disambiguated on the evidence of parallels and the sometimes extensive lists found in other Semitic languages.[20]

Lexicographic study generally concludes that **tan* refers to an animal belonging to the *Canidae* (dogs) or *Strigiformes* (owls).

1. *Jackal.* Traditionally, in part on the basis of etymology,[21] **tan* is interpreted (as in Modern Hebrew) as a name for the golden jackal *(Canis aureus),* which is common throughout Palestine. This interpretation rests on characteristics reflected in the OT texts: *tannîm* live in dry, desolate areas (Isa. 35:7; 43:20; [Mal. 1:3]) or dwell among ruins (Isa. 13:22; 34:13; Jer. 9:10[11]; 10:22; 49:33; 51:37). Mic. 1:8 (and possibly also Job 30:29 and Jer. 14:6[22]) alludes to their mournful howl: *'e'eśeh mispēḏ kattannîm we'ēḇel kiḇnôṯ ya'anâ,* "I will lament like the jackals and mourn like the *benôṯ ya'anâ* [ostriches/owls]." Arid, deserted regions — if not ruins and abandoned cities — are the habitat of the golden jackal.[23] But there remains the problem that Biblical Heb. *'î* (Isa. 13:22; 34:14; Jer. 50:39) is another word that probably refers to the jackal (cf. Arab. *ibn 'āwā,* "jackal," lit. "son of howling";[24] Egyp. *iw,* "canid, jackal"), while only the golden jackal *(Canis aureus)* and, less commonly, the black-backed jackal *(Canis mesomelas)* or side-striped jackal *(Canis adustus)* are native to Palestine.

The other terms for canid carnivores, too, are not always as unambiguous as the translations suggest. The meanings of *keleḇ,*[25] "dog," including the domestic dog *(Canis familiaris)* and the feral dog *(Canis ferus),* and *ze'ēḇ,* "wolf" *(Canis lupus),* are clear, although in other Semitic languages the base *z'b* can also refer to the jackal (Egyp. *z3b,* Akk. *zību*), fox, or hyena.[26] The meanings of Heb. *šû'al* (Jgs. 15:4; Ezk. 13:4; Ps. 63:11[10]; Cant. 2:15; Lam. 5:18; Neh. 3:35[4:3]) is by no means certain, although it is traditionally translated "fox"[27] — including in Palestine the red fox *(Vulpes vulpes),* the sand fox *(Vulpes ruepelli),* and the desert fox or fennec *(Fennecus zerda).* In the wild it is hard to distinguish the golden jackal from the red fox,[28] so that confu-

18. For a more extended discussion of the problem see Müller, 189-201.

19. See, e.g., the glossary and index by P. Riede in Janowski et al., 361-86.

20. See, e.g., B. Landsberger, *Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien nach der 14. Tafel der Serie ar-ra* = ḫubullu. *ASAW, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 42, no. 6 (1934).

21. See I above.

22. See below.

23. Naaktgeboren; Müller-Using and Grzimek; Brehm.

24. Wehr, 36.

25. → VII, 146-57.

26. → IV, 1-7, esp. 1-4.

27. M. J. Mulder, → XIV, 537; P. Maiberger, *NBL,* I, 712.

28. On the differences → XIV, 537.

sion is also possible in written sources.[29] The jackal is 25-32 inches long with a 9-12 inch tail and a shoulder height of 18-20 inches, with long legs. Its fur is pale yellow, with darker flanks verging on black. Its thighs and legs are golden yellow. It has a pointed snout, widely separated ears, light brown eyes, and a round blaze. It is omnivorous and often travels in twos or in larger family packs. The iconography of the canids is also "zoologically" ambiguous.[30]

In Jgs. 15:14 the large number of animals involved has often led scholars to assume that it was jackals that Samson caught and tied together by their tails.[31] In Ps. 63:11(10), too, translators have generally preferred jackals, which feed on carrion, to foxes. Ezk. 13:4 and Lam. 5:18 clearly recall the passages where *tannîm* dwell among abandoned ruins. Even in Cant. 2:15, where the destruction of vineyards is generally blamed on foxes,[32] jackals are possible, since fruits and berries are within the range of their diet. We cannot rule out the possibility that all the instances of *šûʿal* refer to the golden jackal.[33]

The group of animals that are not always clearly differentiated probably also includes the striped hyena *(Hyaena hyaena),* probably to be identified with the *ṣāḇûaʿ* in Jer. 12:9 (cf. 1 S. 13:18; Sir. 13:18).[34] Possibly the demonic *ṣîyîm* (Isa. 13:21; 23:13; 34:14; Jer. 50:39; Ps. 72:9; 74:14[?]), which embody the hostile world of desolate ruins,[35] should be thought of as feral dogs or other canid creatures of desert.

Comparison with the other terms for canids shows clearly that the meaning of **tan* will never be determined precisely (Lam. 4:3 is discussed below). The various words were not sufficiently well defined to permit us today to make precise zoological distinctions among jackal, fox, hyena, and feral dog in our translations.

2. *Owl.* Aharoni has proposed identifying the creature referred to as **tan* as a variety of owl, either *Bubo bubo desertum* or *Bubo interpositus.*[36] His theory has found some acceptance,[37] and more recently Margalith has supported the theory that *tannîm* are birds. The identification with owls is based on their predilection for dwelling in deserted ruins and on the parallelism with *bᵉnôṯ yaʿᵃnâ* in Isa. 34:13; 43:20; Mic. 1:8; and Job 30:29 (cf. Isa. 13:21-22, and also [without *tannîm*] Lev. 11:16; Dt. 14:15; Jer. 50:39).

Aharoni also interprets the *bᵉnôṯ yaʿᵃnâ* as a species of owl (*Bubo bubo ascalaphus*

---

29. Feliks, *Nature,* 101; idem, *EncJud,* III, 11-12; Bodenheimer, 44, 100; Margalith; Mulder, 1194.

30. Barta, 527; O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. tr. 1994), 108-10; E. D. Van Buren, *The Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia as Represented in Art. AnOr* 18 (1939), 13-18.

31. Brehm, 207; Margalith; Mulder, 1193.

32. Keel, *Song,* 108.

33. Margalith, 225.

34. *HAL,* II, 997; J. Feliks, *BHHW,* II, 755; P. Maiberger, *NBL,* I, 206; H.-P. Müller, *ZAW* 79 (1967) 225-28.

35. H.-P. Müller, → XII, 326, 327-28; M. Görg, *NBL,* II, 375-78, esp. 376.

36. Pp. 469-70.

37. Particularly Feliks, *Nature,* 101-2; idem, *EncJud,* III, 13-14; idem, *BHHW,* I, 447.

or *Bubo bubo aharoni*) rather than the traditional ostriches,[38] primarily because the *bᵉnôṯ yaʿᵃnâ* are associated closely with other species of owls in the list of unclean animals (Lev. 11:13-19; Dt. 14:11-18) and because ostriches do not live amid ruins and deserted buildings. Finally, he cites the mournful cries in Mic. 1:8 as evidence against ostriches, on the grounds that ostriches can make only muffled gurgling sounds, certainly not anything that would suggest mourning.

This whole argument is of questionable validity. First, the list of unclean birds includes birds other than owls. Second, ostriches can produce a very wide range of sounds — "Its voice is capable of harmonious cries, guttural sounds both muffled and sharp, snorts, hissing, and reverberant howls when courting or marking its territory. Its repertoire is not inferior to that of a songbird."[39] Finally, Keel's observation is correct: "The argument that *bat yaʿᵃnāh* cannot mean 'ostrich' because the ruins of abandoned cities do not constitute its biotope . . . takes the topos of desolated cities rather too literally. The contrast is not city vs. ruins but inhabited vs. uninhabited land. Uninhabited land is characterized by the presence of steppe-dwelling fauna such as the wild ass, the ostrich, and the gazelle."[40] Finally, there are no convincing arguments for the translation "owl" or "ostrich." The debate is really a standoff. But even if it is true that *bᵉnôṯ yaʿᵃnâ* refers to a species of owl, the parallelism does not prove that *tannîm* belong to the same zoological category.

Lam. 4:3 in particular argues against the identification with any bird: *gam-tannîm ḥālᵉṣû šaḏ hênîqû gûrêhen baṯ-ʿammî lᵉʾaḵzār kayᵉʿēnîm* [cj.] *bammiḏbār,* "Even *tannîm* offer the breast and nurse their young, but the daughter of my people turned to cruelty like ostriches [cj.] in the wilderness." Here *tannîm* clearly refers to a mammal. The argument based on the *K* form *tannîn* (sea monster, dragon, serpent, crocodile) that the text refers to "marine mammals"[41] or — on the evidence of serpent images from Beth-shan — fabulous mammalian serpents with breasts[42] is implausible. If we accept the form as an aramaizing plural and see Lam. 4:3 as an instance of **tan,*[43] the identification of *tannîm* with owls is ruled out.

Subject to the qualifications expressed above, discussion of the various identifications proposed for the animal called **tan* boils down to a preference for a canid, in most cases probably the jackal. With Müller,[44] we must emphasize that, besides taxonomic identification, it is equally important to determine how this name functions. In most passages the *tannîm,* along with other animals, represent a hostile and sinister world.

---

38. Besides Aharoni and Feliks, see also Driver, 12-13; *HAL,* I, 421.

39. F. and E. Sauer, in *Grzimeks Tierleben,* VII, Vögel 1 (Zurich, 1968), 93.

40. O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), 67-68 n. 232; the jackal should be included in the list.

41. Feliks, *Nature,* 102.

42. Margalith, 228.

43. See II above.

44. Pp. 189, 201-2.

I. Etymology and Distribution. The word *tannûr* is a Common Semitic primary noun, related to Akk. *tinūru(m)*[1] and Ugar. *tnrr,* "furnace."[2] A connection with *nûr,* "shine, light,"[3] is disputed. It is also represented by Syr. *tannūrā* and Arab. *tannūr* (cf. *tannūra,* which can also mean "lady's skirt" in Modern Arabic,[4] a usage suggesting the shape of an oven[5]). It appears as a loanword in Greek *(thannoureín/thannourím),*[6] Persian, Turkish, and Armenian.[7] Its meaning is probably not limited to the narrow sense of "bake oven"; comparison with related terms and analysis of usage suggest rather that *tannûr* is a generic term for all kinds of ovens.[8] The 15 occurrences of the lexeme in the OT are distributed broadly, without any significant concentrations. There is also an Old Aramaic occurrence in l. 22 of the Tell Fekheriye statue.[9]

II. Lexical Field. In the broadest sense *tannûr* belongs to the lexical field of "fire,"[10] with which it shares a wealth of connotations: it is hot, dangerous (Ezk. 22:20-22 [*kûr*]), to be treated with great respect; it purifies (Prov. 17:3 [*kûr*]), cleanses, refines (e.g., the late Dtr texts Dt. 4:20 and 1 K. 8:51 think of Egypt as an iron furnace [*kûr*] purifying the people through slavery), and assays (in Isa. 48:10 Israel is tested in the furnace [*kûr*] of adversity). The blazing oven can also ravage and destroy, but it is a daily necessity of life. Because of this ambivalence, an oven, like fire, is a profound symbol for God and God's acts of punishment and love, in the past and in the eschatological future.[11] For example, in Akkadian the goddess Dilbat (the planet Venus) enjoys the epithet *tinūru lā āniḫu,* "unabating furnace," which underscores her fierce and passionate character.[12]

III. Archaeology. Archaeological evidence shows that every house had a bake oven, usually located in the rear room of the house rather than out of doors. It was a bell-shaped circular clay some 15 inches in diameter on the average and generally 15-30 inches high, narrowing slightly toward the top; it could be closed with a cover.

M. Kellermann, "Bäcken," *BRL*², 29-30; idem, "Ofen," *BRL*², 240-41; B. Rothenberg, *Timna* (London, 1973); J. Sanmartín, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (III)," *UF* 11 (1979) 723-28; esp. 728; H. Stegemann, *Library of Qumran* (Eng. tr. Grand Rapids, 1998); G. W. Van Beek, "Tel Gamma 1975-1976," *IEJ* 27 (1977) 171-76; M. Weippert, "Bergbau," *BRL*², 42-44; idem, "Metall und Metallbearbeitung," *BRL*², 219-24; G. Wood, "Kiln," *ABD,* IV, 38-39.

→ כבשׁ *kāḇaš,* → VII, 57.

1. *AHw,* III, 1360.
2. *KTU* 1.119, 9; Sanmartín, 728.
3. A. Herdner, *Ugaritica,* VII (1978), 31.
4. Wehr, 98.
5. See III below.
6. K. Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs* (Heidelberg, 1927), no. 2019.
7. *HAL,* II, 1763.
8. See below.
9. *TUAT,* I/6, 637.
10. → אשׁ *'ēš.*
11. See V below.
12. *CT* 26.42, col. i, 5ff.

defeated by the enemy, make ready a sacrifice 'behind' the river as follows: behind the river, cut in two a human being, a young goat, a young dog, and a young pig, placing one half on one side, the other half on the other. In front, make a gate of *ḫatulkešna* wood and run a cord (?) across it. Then before the gate light a fire on the one side and also light a fire on the other side. Let the troops pass through. As soon as the army comes alongside the river, sprinkle them with water."[33] (2) "If one is going on a road and sees a bird of ill omen, bring a he-goat and a young dog from nearby. Cut the young dog in two and place one part on one side and the other on the other side, and do the same with the he-goat."[34] According to Seebass, these texts and certain Greek traditions[35] suggest an interpretation of the ritual not as a conditional self-imprecation but as an apotropaic and cathartic action to ward off all sinister, harmful, and hostile forces (also in Jer. 34:18-20). For Gen. 15 this interpretation would mean that the oven does not actually pass between the pieces (strictly construed, v. 17 describes only the torch as passing) but symbolizes Yahweh's protection (including protection for the boundaries of the Davidic kingdom, as in Ps. 21:10[9]) against all hostile powers, symbolized by the birds of prey in v. 11.[36]

Isa. 31:9 prophesies the pathetic failure of Assyria's siege of Jerusalem, with the comment that Yahweh and Yahweh alone "has his fire in Zion and his oven in Jerusalem" (cf. 29:2). This could mean simply that this city is Yahweh's hearth and home, a variant of the notion of God's dwelling place. But the oven could also be a theophanic image representing the powerful, menacing presence of Yahweh in his city: "one can burn more than one's fingers if one does not respect the place that Yahweh chose for himself."[37] Less probable is the theory that sees in the oven a cryptic reference to the Valley of Hinnom and the practice of child sacrifice localized there.[38]

b. *God's Judgment.* Three passages use the image of an oven to symbolize God's judgment. As the form requires, the legal ordinances of H conclude with terrible curses if the people are disobedient. The extraordinary distress that will ensue is illustrated vividly in Lev. 26:26: bread for all Jerusalem can be baked in a single oven by ten women, so that the people cannot get enough (cf. l. 22 of the Tell Fekheriye statue) and will turn to cannibalism, devouring their own children.[39]

Lam. 5:10 describes the skin of the starving inhabitants of Jerusalem as being cracked and creased like an oven. "Such an oven develops cracks over the course of time, and is thus a good image for a human body emaciated by hunger."[40]

c. *God's Future.* According to Mal. 3:19(4:1), eschatological judgment, the day of Yahweh, comes like a burning oven, burning up the arrogant and the wicked;[41] note the

---

33. *KUB,* XVII, 28, IV, 45-54; Kümmel, 151.
34. Masson, 7-8.
35. Herodotus *Hist.* 7.39-40; Diodorus Siculus 1.65.
36. Seebass, *Bibl* 64 (1983) 189-210.
37. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 228.
38. Gunkel, *Genesis,* 239.
39. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 368-69; M. Oeming, *BN* 47 (1989) 101-2.
40. H. J. Boecker, *Klagelieder. ZBK* 21 (1985), 92.
41. H. Graf Reventlow, *Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi. ATD* XXV/2 (1993), 157, 159.

distant similarity to the description of Elijah's work in Sir. 48:1: "Then there arose a prophet like fire, whose words were like a burning oven" (Hebrew text [ms. B]; NRSV follows LXX *lampás,* "torch").

In the original version of Ps. 21:10(9), which reflects the royal ideology of Jerusalem, the king turns his face toward his enemies and makes them like a fiery oven, i.e., he burns them up and ravages their land. This idea has been modified by an eschatological revision, which ascribes this omnipotence solely to Yahweh, the heavenly king. In the final recension the introduction of the wrath/theophany motif, "Yahweh will swallow them up in his wrath" (v. 10aγ[9aγ]), shifts the act of judgment to God and God's messianic kingdom.[42]

VI. LXX. Almost without exception, the LXX translates *tannûr* with *klíbanos,* which means "frying pan" in Classical Greek and "oven" in the NT (e.g., Lk. 12:28; as an instrument of God's judgment in Mt. 6:30, as well as 2 Clem. 16:3). Occasionally we find the loanword *thannoureím.* For *kibšān* the LXX uses *káminos,* which is the generic Greek term for all kinds of ovens. In Isa. 31:9 the LXX translator understood *tannûr* as "belonging to a household" *(oikeíos).*

VII. Dead Sea Scrolls. The archaeological problem of the function of the two large ovens at Qumran has a certain significance for the debate over the function of the entire site: monastery, academy, publishing house, villa, or Zealot military camp.[43] The size and construction of the ovens shows clearly that they could not have been used as smelting ovens but can only have been pottery kilns.[44] There are also clearly no smelting ovens in the workshop near the great tower;[45] in particular, there is no trace of any air supply. There is only a fire pit whose function cannot be determined precisely. The theory that Qumran was an armory is therefore untenable in this respect as well.

The word *tannûr* does not occur in the major scrolls, although *kibšān* and *kûr* appear in various contexts. The speaker in 1QH 9:5 laments that his eyes are like a moth in a "smelting furnace." The womb of a pregnant woman is compared to an oven (1QH 3:8,10,12). The soldiers' swords are famed for being refined in a furnace (1QM 5:11); a furnace symbolizes judgment (CD 20:3) and purification (1QH 5:16). The self-deprecating anthropology of the Hodayot includes a passage in which the penitent speaker calls himself a "furnace of iniquity."

Oeming

42. H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. FRLANT* 148 (1989), 210-19; F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Psalmen I. NEB* (1993), 140, 143.

43. Primarily Golb.

44. R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 1973), locus 64 and 84 in the plan in pl. XXXIX; also the photographs in pls. Vb and XIV, in which the air holes for the hot air used in firing ceramics appear clearly.

45. Ibid., locus 125, pl. XIXb.

תַּנִּין *tannîn*

I. Etymology. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Ugaritic; 2. Aramaic. III. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Semantics; 3. Contexts; 4. Toponym; 5. LXX. VI. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The noun *tannîn* is found in Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac,[1] Ethiopic,[2] and Mandaic.[3] From an etymological perspective, we should probably con-

---

tannîn. B. F. Batto, *Slaying the Dragon* (Louisville, 1992); J. Belzer, "Drache," *NBL,* I, 444-46; T. Binger, "Fighting the Dragon," *SJOT* 6 (1992) 139-49; P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, "Le combat de Baʿlu avec Yammu d'après les textes ougaritiques," *MARI* 7 (1993) 63-70; A. Caquot, "Un recueil ougaritique de formules magiques: KTU 1.82," *FS O. Loretz. SEL* 5 (1988) 31-43; A. Cooper and M. H. Pope, "Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts," *RSP,* III, 333-469, esp. 424-28; J. Day, "Dragon and Sea," *ABD,* II, 228-31; idem, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea. UCOP* 35 (1985); J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, "More on Demons in Ugarit," *UF* 16 (1984) 237-50; D. A. Diewert, "Job 7:12," *JBL* 106 (1987) 203-15; G. R. Driver, "Mythical Monsters in the OT," *Studi orientalistici in onore di G. Levi della Vida* (Rome, 1956), 234-49; J.-M. Durand, "Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l'orage et la mer en Mésopotamie," *MARI* 7 (1993) 41-61; O. Eissfeldt, "Gott und das Meer in der Bibel," *KlSchr,* III (1966), 256-64; G. Fuchs, *Mythos und Hiobdichtung* (Stuttgart, 1993); M. Görg, "'Chaos' und 'Chaosmächte' im AT," *BN* 40 (1987) 97-129; J. H. Grønbaek, "Jahves kamp med dragen," *Dansk teologisk tidsskrift* 47 (1984) 81-108; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (^{2}1921; repr. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton* [Eng. tr. Grand Rapids, 2006]); W. Herrmann, "Das Aufleben des Mythos unter den Judäern während des babylonischen Zeitalters," *BN* 40 (1987) 97-129; O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 78 (^{2}1962), esp. 140-52; N. K. Kiessling, "Antecedents of the Medieval Dragon in Sacred History," *JBL* 89 (1970) 167-77; C. Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea* (Amsterdam, 1986); M. C. A. Korpel, *Rift in the Clouds. UBL* 8 (1990), esp. 459-62, 553-59; A. Lelièvre, "YHWH et la mer dans les psaumes," *RHPR* 56 (1976) 253-75; E. Lipiński, *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'Ancien Israël* (Brussels, 1965), esp. 128-35; S. E. Loewenstamm, "Anat's Victory over the Tunnanu," *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 465-70; idem, "The Muzzling of the Tannin in Ugaritic Myth," ibid., 91-92; idem, "The Ugaritic Myth of the Sea and Its Biblical Counterparts," ibid., 465-70; R. Merkelbach, "Drache," *RAC,* IV, 226-50, esp. 235-36; H. Niehr, *Der höchste Gott. BZAW* 190 (1990), esp. 119-40; S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer. CBOT* 9 (1977), esp. 70-71; D. Pardee, "Will the Dragon Never Be Muzzled?" *UF* 16 (1984) 251-55; C. Petersen, *Mythos im AT. BZAW* 157 (1982), esp. 133-34, 139-43; T. Podella, "Der 'Chaoskampfmythos' im AT," in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, eds., *Mesopotamica — Ugaritica — Biblica. FS K. Bergerhof. AOAT* 232 (1993), 283-329; H. Ringgren, "Jahvé et Rahab-Léviatan," in A. Caquot and M. Delcor, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 387-93; M. K. Wakeman, *God's Battle with the Monster* (Leiden, 1973), esp. 77-78; P. van Zijl, "Translation and Discussion of Text 1001:1-3 (RŠ 15.134:1-3)," *JNSL* 2 (1972) 74-85.

→ לויתן *liwyāṯān;* → רהב *rāhaḇ.*

1. *LexSyr,* 828.
2. *LexLingAeth,* 555; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 576a.
3. *MdD,* 480.

sider it a primary noun.[4] From a grammatical perspective, it is a verbal adjective based on the D stem *(qaṭṭil)*.[5]

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *Ugaritic.* A polyglot vocabulary from Ugarit[6] lists a noun *tu-un-na-nu* with the equivalents Sum. MUŠ and Akk. *bašmu,* allowing us to understand Ugar. *tunnanu* as "serpent." In the mythological literature of Ugarit, the *tunnanu* appears in two texts as an opponent of the storm-god Baal and his consort Anat. One[7] describes the *tunnanu* together with *yammu* and *nahar* and other mythological beings as enemies of Baal vanquished by ʿAnat, who muzzles the mouth of the *tunnanu.*[8] The other[9] describes the *tunnanu* and *arš* as denizens of the sea.[10] These texts may allude to a calm sea voyage, which is associated with the craftsman-god Kothar-u-Khasis, Baal's ally,[11] who drives away the sea monster.[12]

Behind the motif of enmity between the storm-god and a serpent stands the Old Hittite Illuyanka myth,[13] which originally described the victory of the serpent over the storm-god and a subsequent defeat of the serpent by the weather-god.[14] Illuyanka is a precursor of *ltn* and *tunnanu.*[15] Even closer to the Ugaritic myth is the Hurrian Kumarbi cycle,[16] which is dominated by the antagonism between the gods Kumarbi and Teshub. Kumarbi, who belongs to the old generation of dethroned gods, has lost his kingdom and battles the storm-god Teshub with the aid of the sea. The mention of Mt. Hazzi (Zaphon) in the Song of Ullikummi,[17] which belongs to the Kumarbi cycle, places it in northern Syria.

The motif of the battle between the storm-god and the sea appears for the first time in one of the Mari letters,[18] with reference to Hadad of Aleppo. The battle between the storm-god and the serpent represents a later development of this motif.[19] In the Mari letter the context for the motif of the battle between the storm-god and the sea is a king's seizure of power, a context that can be traced subsequently at Ugarit[20] and in the OT.[21]

---

4. *HAL,* II, 1764.

5. J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription. HSS* 32 (1987), 72.

6. *Ugaritica,* V, 137, I, 8′.

7. *KTU* 1.3, III, 39-43.

8. On the various interpretations of this passage see Cooper and Pope, 425; M. Krebernik, in W. Gross et al., eds., *Text, Methode und Grammatik. FS W. Richter* (St. Ottilien, 1991), 260.

9. *KTU* 1.6, VI, 51.

10. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980) 399-400.

11. C. Uehlinger, *Bibl* 71 (1990) 521 n. 99.

12. M. Dijkstra, *UF* 17 (1985) 149; J. C. de Moor, *Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Niasaba* 16 (Leiden, 1987), 99; J. Tropper and E. Verreet, *UF* 20 (1988) 341.

13. *CTH* 321.

14. H. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths. SBLWAW* 2 (Atlanta, 1990), 10-14.

15. E. von Schuler, *WbMyth,* I (1963), 177-78.

16. *CTH* 343-46, 348-64.

17. *CTH* 345.

18. Mari letter A.1968; Durand, 43-46.

19. Durand, 56-57.

20. Bordreuil and Pardee, 66-67.

21. See III.3.a below.

The *tunnanu* appears in magical texts as well as in mythological literature. The first three lines of a collection of magical formulas[22] call on Baal to destroy *(mḫṣ)* the *tunnanu* and collect (?)[23] the arrows of Rashap. This marks the beginning of the demonization of the *tunnanu.* A spell in another text also refers to Baal's battle with the *tunnanu.*[24] The mention of the tongues (dual?) of the *tunnanu* shows that it had more than one head,[25] and the mention of tails (dual) indicates that it had one (or several) pair(s) of tails.[26] Here too[27] the *tunnanu* is muzzled.[28]

In yet another text the demonization of the *tunnanu* noted above appears again, this time in conjunction with illness.[29] The fragmentary text may describe the god El as using a clay figurine to exorcize, by means of sympathetic magic, the *tunnanu* demons afflicting King Krt.[30]

2. *Aramaic.* The earliest occurrence of *tnn* in Aramaic is in Ahiqar.[31] The gentle words (of the king?[32]) break the ribs of a *tnîn* (cf. Prov. 25:15; Sir. 28:17), here thought of as a dragon rather than a serpent. An inscribed Aramaic incantation bowl compares the noise of demons to the hissing of serpents *(tnyn').*[33] Other bowl inscriptions combine *ltn* and *tnyn',* referring to *ltn* as *tnn.*[34] Iconographically, the *tannîn* as "serpent" may be likened to serpents disporting themselves in the water as depicted on an Old Syriac seal from Tell el-Dabaʿa[35] and reliefs from Nimrud[36] and Nineveh.[37]

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* In the OT *tannîn* occurs 15 times, split equally among the Pentateuch (1 in Genesis, 3 in Exodus, 1 in Deuteronomy), the Prophets (2 in Isaiah, 1 in Jeremiah, 2 in Ezekiel), and the Writings (3 in Psalms, 1 each in Job and Nehemiah). None of these occurrences can be assigned to the preexilic period.

The proposed emendation of the MT in Ps. 44:20(Eng. 19) from *tannîm,* "jackals,"

---

22. *KTU* 1.82.

23. Caquot, 33-34; *TO,* II, 63.

24. *KTU* 1.83.

25. *KTU* 1.83, 5.

26. Caquot, 29; E. Verreet, *Modi ugaritici. OLA* 27 (1988), 78.

27. As in *KTU* 1.3, III, 39ff.

28. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 14 (1982) 77-81; D. Pardee, *UF* 16 (1984) 251-55; Caquot, 29.

29. *KTU* 1.16, V, 31ff.

30. De Moor, *Anthology,* 219-20.

31. Ahiqar 105-6.

32. On the text see I. Kottsieper, *Die Sprache der Aḥiqarsprüche. BZAW* 194 (1990), 12, 20.

33. Bowl 13.11; J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* (Jerusalem, 1985), 200.

34. Bowl 2.4; 7.7,9; C. D. Isbell, *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls. SBLDS* 17 (Missoula, 1975), 19, 31-32.

35. M. Bietak, *Ägypten und Levante* 1 (Vienna, 1990), 15, fig. 5.

36. C. Uehlinger, *Bibl* 71 (1990) 516, fig. 2; 523.

37. Ibid., 518, fig. 3.

תָּעָה tā'â; תּוֹעָה tô'â; טעה ṭ'h

I. Etymology. II. 1. Distribution; 2. Lexical Field. III. OT: 1. Secular Usage; 2. Theological Usage. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The Hebrew verbal root *t'h,* "wander about, stagger, stray,"[1] probably has an East Semitic etymology: the cognate Akk. *ṭātu(m), ṭa'tu* means "mandatory contribution, bribe."[2] In Old Assyrian it means "impost," at Nuzi "baksheesh"; later it comes to mean a "contribution" to appease the king of a "bribe" given to a judge. The noun *ṭa'tūtu* means "political contribution." Thus the East Semitic evidence already suggests that the root has ethically negative connotations.

The only occurrence in Ugaritic[3] is disputed: *rǵb rǵbt wtǵt[ ]hm ǵm' ǵmît,* "are you very hungry, having journeyed afar?"[4] or (very differently) "undoubtedly you are hungry, then take a mouthful."[5] The translation "journey afar" seems more appropriate, but the translation "wander about, stagger" is also acceptable in the context.[6]

The Hebrew noun *tô'â,* "wandering, error," a nominalized participle,[7] is a feminine *nomen unitatis* (a noun representing a single instance of something).[8] In Hebrew we also find an aramaizing by-form *ṭ'h,*[9] "stray"; cf. also Jewish Aram. *ṭ*'' (and the less common targumic *t*''), "err," in Middle Hebrew "wander about."[10] The noun form *ṭā'ûṯā'* also appears in Jewish Aramaic (1QTestLevi 31), but the fragmentary context makes its meaning unclear.

The root also appears in Syriac (*ṭᵉ'ā',* "err, go astray"),[11] Christian Palestinian Aramaic,[12] Palmyrene (*ṭ'y,* "err, make a mistake"),[13] and Mandaic (*ṬAA,* "err, go wrong").[14] In Arabic we find the vb. *ṭaǧā* (III *y/w*), "exceed proper bounds, be exces-

---

tā'â. H. A. Brongers, "Darum, wer fest zu stehen meint, sehe zu, dass er nicht falle," in M. A. Beek et al., eds., *Symbolae biblicae et mesopotamicae. FS F. M. T. de Liagre Böhl* (Leiden, 1973), 56-70, esp. 65.

1. *HAL,* I, 377; II, 1704, 1766-67.
2. *AHw,* III, 1382.
3. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 33.
4. *CML*², 59, 159.
5. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 200.
6. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 4 (1968) 311.
7. *BLe,* §475q.
8. *HAL,* II, 1704; cf. Michel, 64.
9. Wagner, 116.
10. *ANH*³, 172, 445. On the shift from *t* to *ṭ,* see J. F. A. Sawyer, *TLOT,* III, 1431.
11. *LexSyr,* 282.
12. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 76.
13. *DISO,* 102.
14. *MdD,* 171.

sive,"[15] and the noun *ṭāğin,* "one who departs from the proper way, tyrant," from which developed Eth. *ṭā'ōt,* "idol."[16]

II. 1. *Distribution.* The root *t'h* appears frequently in the OT. There are 50 occurrences of the vb. *tā'â:* 27 in the qal, 21 in the hiphil, and 2 in the niphal (Job 15:31 [possible; see below]; Isa. 19:14 [inf. const.]). The noun *tô'â* occurs twice (Isa. 32:6; Neh. 4:2 [Eng. 8]). The vb. *ṭā'â* probably occurs twice: the qal ptcp. in Cant. 1:7[17] and a hiphil in Ezk. 13:10.

2. *Lexical Field.* The meaning places the root in the lexical field "stagger, stumble, tremble," which has been studied in detail by Brongers, who finds the phenomenon of instability represented in Hebrew by the following vbs.: *gā'aš* (principally in the Jeremiah tradition), *zālal, zûa',* → מוג *mûg, mûḏ* (only in Hab. 3:6), → מוט *mûṭ* (esp. in the Psalms), → מעד *mā'aḏ,* → נוע *nûa'* (frequent in the Isaiah tradition), *pûq,* → רגז *rāgaz, rā'aḏ,* → רעש *rā'aš,* and → שגה/שגג *šāgâ/šāgag.*

The lexical field of "going, walking" is related in both secular and theological usage (→ בוא *bô';* → הלך *hālak̲;* → דרך *derek̲*).

In secular usage the "straying" of animals is a common topos. It is domestic animals in particular that appear with striking frequency as the subject of or in connection with *tā'â.* For example, one is expected to return a donkey that has "gone astray," even if it belongs to an enemy (Ex. 23:4); here *tā'â* overlaps somewhat with the meaning of *'āḇaḏ* (cf. Dt. 26:5; 1 S. 9:3,20). This usage even extends to plants: Isa. 16:8 describes vines as "straying" into the desert, probably a reference to the ousted inhabitants of Moab.[18]

In theological usage the meaning "err, go astray" can represent sinful behavior, associating the root with the lexical field of sin and its consequences (→ עון *'āwôn;* → פשע *peša';* etc.).

III. OT.

1. *Secular Usage.* In prophetic and sapiential contexts, the vb. *tā'â* in its basic meaning belongs to the group of verbs of motion that have the specialized sense of "wander about, stray." At the end of Ps. 119, a long psalm on the theme of the *tôrâ,* the psalmist claims to have "gone astray" like a lost sheep (*tā'îṯî k̲eśeh 'ōḇēḏ,* v. 176). Even the hungry young ravens would "wander about" for lack of food if God did not provide for them (Job 38:41).

The lexical field of *tā'â* includes the "wilderness";[19] its geographical nature makes orientation very difficult: "Some wandered in desert wastes, finding no way to an inhabited town" (Ps. 107:4). Hagar, sent away by Abraham with only the scantiest provi-

15. Wehr, 561.
16. E. Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible* (London, 1968), 122.
17. Contra Sawyer, *TLOT,* III, 1431.
18. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1974), 73.
19. →מדבר *miḏbār.*

vestras).[33] The *Q hiṯʿêṯem* is clearly preferable to the *K*, which is an error;[34] the LXX has *eponēreúsasthe*, representing the hiphil of *r*ʿʿ, which avoids the problem instead of solving it. Carroll accepts the normal meaning of *tāʿâ* and translates: "that you have gone astray at the cost of your lives."[35] Holladay supplies the missing object from the context and translates: "You have led astray the whole group at the cost of your lives."[36] This approach makes it unnecessary to postulate a special meaning of *tāʿâ* here.

It is also possible for Yahweh to lead entire nations or elements of his own people astray. To this end he places a "bridle that leads astray" on the jaws of the nations (Isa. 30:28).[37] In Ps. 107:40 it is the princes (*n*ᵉ*ḏîḇîm*) that he makes wander in trackless wastes. Even the group of Yahweh's *ʿ*ᵃ*ḇāḏîm* can ask: "Why do you make us stray from your ways?" (Isa. 63:17). Even in this late postexilic text, "straying from the way" is still associated with the wilderness wanderings of the exodus (vv. 11-14). Straying from the way of Yahweh's instruction is as fatal as straying from the way in the wilderness.

IV. 1. *LXX*. The LXX had no problem with translating this lexeme, almost without exception using *planán* and its derivatives, and using *plánēsis* for the noun in Isa. 32:6.[38] Thus the LXX adopts the usage of Classical Greek literature, where the verb means "lead/go astray," used of human beings, animals, embodied souls, etc. In epistemological and ethical contexts, it means "lead astray, deceive"; in religious and metaphysical contexts it means "go wrong," with overtones of tragic delusion. But the LXX gives the lexeme its own emphasis, which is theologically significant: the word group indicates a reprehensible straying that deliberately rebels against God and God's demands, manifests itself in idolatry, and therefore must be punished.

Berges

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls*. The root *tʿh* occurs some 40 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, always in the negative religious or theological sense of going or leading astray. In CD 3–4 we have what amounts to a theological survey of history with *tʿh* as a key word. This passage traces Israel's willful straying from the time of Noah's sons (3:1) through the sons of Jacob (3:4) to the present-day community (3:14; cf. also 4Q216 1 2:11), which understands its members as being the true sons of Zadok (4:1, based on Ezk. 44:15). The personified antagonist of the *yaḥaḏ* is of course the man or prophet of lies with his followers; it is he who "led Ephraim and many astray" (4QpNah 2:8; cf. 3:5; 1QS 5:11; 1QH 4:12; 1QpHab 10:9; 4QPsᵃ 1:15,18; CD 1:15 par.; 2:17; 5:20 par.). Some passages interpret these wicked actions of the opponents as being predestined (CD 2:13;

33. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 256-57; see *HAL*, II, 1767.
34. See *BHS*.
35. R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. OTL* (1986), 719.
36. W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2. Herm* (1989), 301.
37. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. tr. 2002), 185, 187.
38. H. Braun, *TDNT*, VI, 228-53.

4Q266 18 5:10); elsewhere the community, which has withdrawn from this baneful environment (4QpNah 3:5; 4QpHos[a] 2:5), expresses its sense of God's protection and support (1QH 4:25; 4QpNah 3:7; 4QpPs[a] 2:9; 3:3). Certain occurrences in the Community Rule may also be noted. A member of the community must not "go astray following his heart" (1QS 5:4). The speaker of 1QS 11:1 promises to "teach understanding to those with a stray spirit *(tw'y rwḥ).*" Transgression of a law is also described as going astray, e.g., desecrating the Sabbath or a festival (CD 12:3).

The occurrences in prayers and hymns are all in fragmentary contexts. We can only cite such expressions as "straying without return" (4Q501 1 3; 4Q509 12-13 1), confusion of the spirit of understanding (*rwḥ bynh,* 4Q510 1 6 = 4Q511 10 2), confusion in humiliation (4Q511 8 5), and the error of blindness (4Q513 4 4), without more specific relationship to their setting.

Dahmen

תֹּף *tōp;* תפף *tpp*

I. Etymology, Occurrences. II. Instrument. III. Archaeological Evidence. IV. OT Usage.

---

tōp. B. P. Aign, *Die Geschichte der Musikinstrumente des Ägäischen Raumes bis um 700 vor Christus* (Frankfurt am Main, 1963); E. G. Anati, "Una scena di danza nel Negev Centrale," *Rivista di scienze preistoriche* 10 (1955) 70-75; L. Badre, *Les figurines anthropomorphes en terre cuite à l'âge du Bronze en Syrie* (Paris, 1980); J. P. Brown, "The Mediterranean Vocabulary of the Vine," *VT* 19 (1969) 146-70, esp. 164-68; M. Dothan, "The Musicians of Ashdod," *Archaeology* 23 (1970) 310-11; D. H. Hillers, "The Goddess with the Tambourine," *CTM* 41 (1970) 606-19; I. H. Jones, "Musical Instruments in the Bible: Part I," *BT* 37 (1986) 101-16; J. Karageorghis, *La grand déesse de Chypre et son culte* (Lyon, 1977); V. Karageorghis, "Amathus Between the Greeks and the Phoenicians," *Atti del II congresso internazionale di studi fenici e punici* (Rome, 1991), 3:961ff.; idem, "The Terracottas," in idem and O. Picard, eds., *La Necropole. Études chypriotes* 9 (Nicosia, 1987), 113-367; O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. tr. 1978, repr. Winona Lake, 1997), esp. 339-40; C. L. Meyers, "Of Drums and Damsels," *BA* 54 (1991) 16-27; idem, "A Terracotta at the Harvard Semitic Museum and Disc-holding Female Figures Reconsidered," *IEJ* 37 (1987) 116-22; S. Michaelides, *The Music of Ancient Greece* (London, 1978); D. Paquette, *L'instrument de musique dans la céramique de la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1984); J. B. Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known through Literature. AOS* 24 (1943); idem, *Sarepta* (Philadelphia, 1975); F. Vandenabeele, "Has Phoenician Influence Modified Cypriote Terracotta Production?" in E. Peltenburg, ed., *Early Society in Cyprus* (Edinburgh, 1989), 266-71; M. Wegner, *Die Musikinstrumente des Alten Orients. Orbis Antiquus* 2 (Münster, 1950); idem, *Das Musikleben der Griechen* (Berlin, 1949).

In Lam. 2:14 *tpl* characterizes pejoratively the nature of the prophetic vision; the ruin of daughter Zion (v. 13) has been brought about by the leaders of the people (v. 14): "Your prophets have seen for you *šāw' w^e^tāp̄ēl;* they have not exposed your iniquity to restore your fortunes, but they have seen for you *maś'ôṯ šāw' ûmaddûḥîm.*" Some propose the more precise sense "deception and whitewash," from *tpl* II.[15] But the repeated use of *šāw'* as a parallel term describing the substance of the prophets' vision, together with their failure to expose Zion's iniquity, also supports the translation "empty, meaningless, deceptive."[16]

2. *Jer. 23:13; Job 1:22; 24:12.* The fem. noun *tip̄lâ* in Jer. 23:13 and Job 1:22 may be a *nomen unitatis* (a noun representing a single instance of something) in contrast to the collective *tāp̄ēl.*[17] The context of Jer. 23:13 is polemic against false prophets. In vv. 11-12 Yahweh states that he has observed the wickedness of the priests and prophets in his own house; in v. 13 he speaks of the northern kingdom: "In the prophets of Samaria, too, *rā'îṯî tip̄lâ:* they prophesied by Baal and led my people astray." Alongside the shocked conduct of the prophets in Jerusalem (v. 14), Yahweh has observed *tip̄lâ* in Samaria, prophetic speech that is totally wrong, foolish, and incomprehensible, as the mention of prophesying by Baal and leading the people astray suggests (cf. LXX^{A} *ánalon;* Symm. *aphrosýnē*).[18] Others place more emphasis on the ethical dimension (LXX *anomḗmata;* Tg. *rš'*).[19]

Following Job's patient affirmation, in the midst of his sufferings, of God's freedom to give and to take away (Job 1:21), v. 22 says of Job's words and conduct: "In all this, Job did not sin or utter anything improper against God *(w^e^lō'-nāṯan tip̄lâ lē'lōhîm).*" These words can be understood as meaning that there was nothing improper in Job's conduct toward God, that he said nothing rash.[20] The syntax, however, given its positive analog *ntn kbwd l-,* "give glory to [Yahweh or God]," in 1 S. 6:5; Jer. 13:16; Prov. 26:8, as well as the translations of LXX and Symmachus, suggests associating *tip̄lâ* with God — i.e., Job did not accuse God of impulsiveness, error, or misconduct.[21]

The third instance of *tip̄lâ* is textually problematic. In the course of describing the

---

15. *HAL,* II, 1776, following W. Rudolph, *Ruth — Hohe Lied — Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 220.

16. See the examples in *HAL,* II, 1776, as well as W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 631: "The prophecies of the prophets in Lam 2:14 lack reality"; Propp, 405: "vanity"; Kedar-Kopfstein, 54: "bland."

17. Michel, 64-68.

18. W. McKane, *Jeremiah 1. ICC* (1986), 573-74: "lack of intellectual discrimination"; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1,* 630: "fatuous"; Kedar-Kopfstein, 54.

19. R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. OTL* (1986), 454: "I saw an unsavoury thing."

20. *HAL,* II, 1776; cf. F. Horst, *Hiob I: 1–19. BK* XVI/1 (1968), 2, 10; Tg.: "blasphemous words."

21. G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 87-88; Driver and Gray, *Job,* I, 20: "nor charged God with unworthiness"; M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* (^{3}1973), 16-17; L. Alonso-Schökel and J. L. Sicre Díaz, *Job* (Madrid, 1983), 96-97: "nor accused God of foolishness"; Tur-Sinai, *Job,* 20-21; Kedar-Kopfstein, 154.

תפשׂ *tpś*

I. Meaning and Distribution. II. Usage: 1. Wield; 2. Grasp; 3. Capture; 4. Conquer; 5. Legal Facts. III. Later Development: 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. LXX.

I. Meaning and Distribution. The vb. *tpś* is a verb of motion meaning "reach out to grasp." The object grasped may be employed for destructive ends but may also serve a useful purpose. Like → חזק *ḥzq* hiphil, many instances describe a violent act of grasping that serves as a prelude to a subsequent action. When cities or lands are "seized," *tpś* (like → לכד *lāḵaḏ*) stands metonymically for conquest.

Old Bab. *tapāšum,* which probably means "take into custody,"[1] is related to *tpś.* In the sense of "attack, seize, assail," *tpś* corresponds to Arab. *baṭaša.*[2] In Middle Hebrew the root, usually with the consonants *tps,* covers a semantic spectrum that extends from "touch" through "grasp" to "capture";[3] the nominal derivatives *t^epîs/śâ* and *t^epûsâ* express the aspect of "seizure."[4]

The 65 OT occurrences of the verb are distributed unevenly: 2 in Genesis, 2 in Numbers, 4 in Deuteronomy, 2 in Joshua, 2 in 1 Samuel, 6 in 1 Kings, 8 in 2 Kings, 1 in 2 Chronicles, 2 in Psalms, 2 in Proverbs, 2 in Isaiah, 18 in Jeremiah, 12 in Ezekiel, 1 in Amos, and 1 in Habakkuk (plus 1 in Sirach). Most of the occurrences are in the qal; there are 15 instances of the niphal and 1, textually uncertain, of the piel (Prov. 30:28; the LXX reading *ereidómenos* more likely represents a niphal). Both transitive and intransitive constructions are found (side by side in Jer. 37:13-14), without any apparent semantic difference.

The occurrences are concentrated in DtrH, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, i.e., in texts from the late preexilic and exilic period. The lexeme is underrepresented in the Minor Prophets (once each in Amos and Habakkuk) and Writings (twice each in Psalms and Proverbs). It is noteworthy that the Chronicler does not speak explicitly of the captivities and conquests mentioned in his sources, except in 2 Ch. 25:23 (cf. 2 K. 14:13).

The lexical field of "grasping" includes *'ḥz, ḥzq, lkd, lqḥ, qmṭ,* and *tmk.* The combined action of tracking down and seizing a person is expressed by three verbs having *p* and *ś* as their final two consonants: *ḥpś* ("seek"), *tpś* ("grasp"), and *rpś* ("tread, strike").

The use of *tpś* with *lēḇ* (Ezk. 14:5) and *šēm* (Prov. 30:9) is quite striking. The use of a participial form of the verb with various objects is common: musical instruments (*kinnôr* and *'ûgāḇ,* Gen. 4:21), agricultural implements (*maggāl,* Jer. 50:16), ship's tackle (*māšōṯ,* Ezk. 27:29), weapons (*qešeṯ,* Am. 2:15; Jer. 46:9; *ḥ^arāḇôṯ,* Ezk. 38:4; *māḡēn,* Jer. 46:9), battle (*milḥāmâ,* Nu. 31:27), and finally *hattôrâ* (Jer. 2:8; Sir. 15:1 [anarthrous]).

---

1. *AHw,* III, 1320; see also W. von Soden, *UF* 13 (1981) 164 = *Bibel und alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 204.
2. Wehr, 63.
3. Jastrow, 1688-89.
4. *WTM,* IV, 661.

II. Usage.

1. *Wield.* While the hiphil of → חזק *ḥzq* does not always imply an element of violence, and the reasons for the act of grasping or holding are quite various, *tpś* is regularly predicated of people whose actions have a brachial component or effect. This is largely true even for the few statements that presuppose a technical mastery achieved by practice: use of physical strength is envisioned when oarsmen (*tōpᵉśê māšôṯ,* Ezk. 27:29[5]) are mentioned in the poem about the Phoenician port of Tyre. This is also true in the oracle against Babylon in the oracles against foreign nations in the book of Jeremiah: using the figure of the part for the whole, Jer. 50:16 calls for the sower *(zôrēaʿ)* to be cut off; the parallel line refers to the wielder of the sickle *(tōpēś maggāl).*

In this case the final effect of the implement used by the peasant who wields the sickle is productive. In the case of weapons of war, the destructive effect of their mastery is beyond question, although in the oracle against Egypt those who carry the shield (*tōpᵉśê māgēn,* Jer. 46:9) do so for protection, in contrast to those who draw the bow. In Am. 2:14-16, an oracle against Israel, the prophet prognosticates the helplessness of various groups of combatants, including charioteers and archers (*tōpēś haqqešeṯ,* 2:15; cf. *dāraḵ qešeṯ,* Jer. 46:9; 50:14,29; 51:3; etc.).

In the book of Ezekiel the sword appears as a weapon to be "wielded": leaving the agent anonymous, the song of the sword in Ezk. 21:13-22(Eng. 8-17) speaks of someone who commands another to grasp (*liṯpōś bakkāp̄,* v. 16[11]) a weapon and use it for killing. In 30:24-25, with reference to Egypt, the text is explicit: the sword of Yahweh is placed in the hand of the king of Babylon. An earlier verse declares that the wound inflicted on Pharaoh by Yahweh makes it impossible for him to wield a sword (*liṯpōś beḥereḇ,* v. 21).

In another passage (29:7) Ezekiel borrows the metaphor of a broken reed (1 K. 18:21; Isa. 36:6) and applies it to Egypt, exposing Israel's unwarranted reliance on Pharaoh; he describes Pharaoh as a reed (a plant characteristic of Egypt) that breaks and injures those who grasp it (*bᵉṯopśām bakkap̄* [*Q*]). The ambivalence of the vb. *tpś,* which has both productive and destructive aspects, is particularly evident here, although of course there is also a correlation between destruction and protection when weapons are grasped. The description of Gog's army includes swordsmen (*tōpᵉśê ḥᵃrāḇôṯ,* Ezk. 38:4). The translation "armed with swords" is too static, since *tpś* has overtones of active aggression.[6] In addition, the use of *tpś* is not limited to particular weapons. The verb can take *milḥāmâ* ("war, battle") as its object and thus be used to refer to the warriors (*tōpᵉśê hammilḥāmâ,* glossed as *hayyōṣᵉʾîm laṣṣāḇāʾ,* Nu. 31:27) to whom Moses is to give half the booty after their victory over the Midianites.

Because fingers and hands have an important function in the playing of certain stringed and wind instruments, Gen. 4:19-22 presents Jubal, one of the sons of Lamech, not as the inventor of a cultural achievement but as the ancestor of those who

5. E. (Strömberg) Krantz, *Das Schiffes Weg mitten im Meer. CBOT* 19 (1982), 110-18, 180-83, 189-92.

6. Contra W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 285.

ther intent. Potiphar's wife wants to force Joseph into a sexual relationship. After several unsuccessful attempts, she tears off his garment (*beged*, Gen. 39:12) — a kind of symbolic claim to possession. Her accusation (vv. 13-18), which turns the situation on its head, finally leads to Joseph's imprisonment (vv. 19-20).

A consecutive sense with legal implications also lies behind the action of the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite in 1 K. 11:29-31. The Dtr account,[18] which is intended to legitimate the northern kingdom, describes Ahijah's encounter with Jeroboam, a high official of the royal court, during a revolt against Solomon: he lays hold of Jeroboam's new garment *(śalmâ)*, tears *(qrʿ)* it into twelve pieces, and tells Jeroboam to take ten of them.

The legal background of Dt. 9:17 is also clear. Recapitulating Israel's wilderness wanderings, Moses recounts how on his return from Horeb he smashed the two stone tablets (*lûḥōṯ hāʾᵃbānîm*, v. 10; identified in v. 11 as *luḥôṯ habbᵉrîṯ*) before the eyes of the people when he saw how they had sinned. The action itself is apportioned among three verbs, which together stage the act of destruction. Moses is carrying the tablets in his hands, from which he need only let them drop; instead, he takes hold of them and flings them away, thus smashing them *(tpś, šlḥ, šbr)*. Because the tablets' destruction is determined when Moses takes hold of them and the two verbs are thus correlated, the text does not simply use *lkd*. Their destruction is not an action in the heat of the moment (contrast Ex. 32:19) but "a legal action on the part of the competent individual, to which the people serve as witness. . . . In the ancient Near East, a contract was not considered legally annulled until its documentation was destroyed."[19]

3. *Capture*. The vb. *tpś* is often used when people are seized and taken prisoner. Thus usage accounts for a third of all its occurrences, almost all of which are in historical traditions, except for Ps. 10:2 and 71:11. In Ps. 10:2 the psalmist laments that Yahweh has hidden himself and that the defenseless *(ʿānî)* are at the mercy of *(dlq//tpś)* the wicked *(rāšāʿ)*. In Ps. 71, a poetic prayer, the psalmist's enemies determine to pursue and seize him when they see him defenseless *(ʾên maṣṣîl)*. As in Ps. 10, pursuit *(rdp)* precedes capture; according to v. 13, the psalmist's life is in danger (*śṭn* with *nepeš* and *bqš* with *rāʿâ*).

The other texts rarely stray from the political and military arena. One exception is 1 K. 18:40: when the prophets of Baal fail to demonstrate Baal's preeminence in the sacrificial contest on Mt. Carmel, Elijah has the people seize them. After their arrest, they are killed at Wadi Kishon (Nahr el-Muqaṭṭaʿ). By contrast, nothing is said of the fate of the anonymous man of God whom Jeroboam orders to be seized (1 K. 13:4). Instead, in a kind of reversal, the hand that Jeroboam had stretched out "potently" toward the man of God is rendered mysteriously impotent. Without mentioning specific individuals, Isa. 3:6 relates to domestic politics; in its context (vv. 1-11) Isaiah foretells the overthrow the political order in Jerusalem.[20] Within this semantic frame of reference,

---

18. E. Würthwein, *Könige I: 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1977), 139, 143-44.
19. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1–16,17*. NEB (1986), 78.
20. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. tr. 1991), 127-28.

v. 6 is ironic: with the words "You have a cloak, you shall be our leader," someone within the clan must be appointed to restore the topsy-turvy order by taking charge of the ruins.

Apart from these three passages, it is always persons in the political or military arena who are involved. During the conquest of Ai (Khirbet et-Tell), the king is taken alive (*tpś ḥāy,* Josh. 8:23) and brought to Joshua, who has him killed and hanged on a tree (v. 29; cf. Josh. 10:26-27; 1 S. 31:10). Saul is to impose the ban on the Amalekites, just as Joshua imposed it on the inhabitants of Ai. And just as Joshua took the king of Ai alive, so Saul takes Agag, the king of the Amalekites, alive (*tpś ḥāy,* 1 S. 15:8). Clearly acting high-handedly (and contrary to the implications of *tpś*), however, he refuses to go beyond holding the king captive (cf. 1 S. 15:20). On another occasion, this time in Saul's conflict with David, he and his men are tracking down David and his followers in the "wilderness of Maon" (*miḏbar mā'ôn,* east of Khirbet Maʿin) and surround them (*'ṭr*) in order to capture them (*leṯopśām,* 1 S. 23:26). The outcome is not reported.

A statement in 1 K. 20:18, set in the period of the Aramean wars, provides an example of how the balance of military power was assessed: when Ben-hadad is informed that the Israelite troops are making a sortie from Samaria, which he has been besieging, the drunken king jokingly says: "If they have come out for peace, take them alive (*tip̱śûm ḥayyîm*); if they have come out for war, take them alive (*ḥayyîm tip̱śûm*) (as well)." But this remains purely theoretical, as in 2 K. 7:12, where, through a tactical ruse on the part of the Arameans, the Israelites are to fall into a trap and be taken alive (*tpś ḥayyîm*).

The typical sequence of events involving *tpś* is recorded in 2 K. 10:14. Between Jezreel (Zerʿin) and Samaria (Sebasṭiye), the usurper Jehu slaughters 42 princes of Judah. It is clear from v. 14 that seizing and slaughtering constitute an almost ritual act. No explicit order to kill is given. But the account of how Jehu's command (*tip̱śûm ḥayyîm*) is carried goes on to include the killing of those taken: "And they took them alive and slaughtered them (*šḥṭ*)." From 2 K. 14:13, however, we see that capture was not always the prelude to death: Jehoash of Israel takes Amaziah of Judah captive at Beth-shemesh (Tell er-Rumele) and — to humiliate the Judahite king — enters Jerusalem with him after razing its walls. The Chronicler provides a toned-down version of this account that does not mention the shameful entry explicitly (2 Ch. 25:23).

The other occurrences of the verb that refer to capture are concentrated at the end of the monarchy. A metaphorical discourse about a young lion (*kep̱îr,* Ezk. 19:3) just old enough to catch prey laments that the nations have caught it in their trap and brought it with hooks to the land of Egypt (v. 4). In contrast to 2 K. 23:33, this text describes Jehoahaz as having been carried off brutally (cf. also Ezk. 38:4; 2 K. 19:28//Isa. 37:29; 2 Ch. 33:11; Am. 4:2). Ezk. 19:8 similarly laments another young lion (probably Jehoiachin): the nations have spread a net over it, caught it (*tpś*) in their trap, and taken it to Babylon in bondage. Only in Ezekiel are the means named by which the victims are captured and taken away. In Ezk. 12:13 it is probably Zedekiah over whom the prophet expects Yahweh to spread his net; Yahweh will catch him in his snare (also in 17:20) and bring him to Babylon.

says that the "fall" of a city is marked by the "descent" *(yrd)* of its population (towns being generally more populous than the surrounding countryside). In a similar context, 2 K. 16:9 reports that Tiglath-pileser marched up against Damascus, took it *(tpś),* and carried its people away captive (*glh* hiphil). Sennacherib's conquest of the fortified cities of Judah is described in similar terms (2 K. 18:13//Isa. 36:1), although only the deportations of the so-called third campaign of the Assyrian are described.[29]

When the oracles against the nations in the book of Jeremiah describe the fall of Babylon, its conquest is expanded to include the countryside, or the text alternates between the city and the land. Babylon's capture is verbalized extravagantly (50:23-24). Correlated with its "taking" (*lkd;* cf. also 51:41 and 51:31-32; besides the city itself, the latter also mentions the seizing of the fords [*hammaʿbārôṯ niṯpāśû*]) we find the image of a snare *(yqš);* capture *(tpś)* is preceded by discovery *(mṣʾ).* The inhabitants of the city or the land are also the subject of Jer. 50:46, where the advance of the "foe from the north" against Babylon makes it possible to proclaim that Babylon has been captured and its inhabitants dragged away (*sḥb,* v. 45).

In two other Jeremiah passages *tpś* refers not to violent conquest but to "occupying" a place of residence. Jer. 49:7-22 is an oracle concerning Edom, presented metaphorically as an eagle or vulture *(nešer)* that makes its nest on the heights; the mountain cities are secure: Edom dwells (ptcp. of *škn* with *ḥireq compaginis*) in the clefts of the rock and thus "occupies" (ptcp. of *tpś* with *ḥireq compaginis*) the heights (v. 16). In 40:10, after the fall of Jerusalem, Gedaliah orders those left behind in the land — according to v. 7, the leaders of the forces in the open country and their troops — to carry out their agricultural duties and "reoccupy" *(tpś)* the towns. Similarly, all the women and men of Judah who had been scattered in the confusion of battle now return to their towns (v. 12). Here, as it were, *tpś* reverses the usual occurrence of conquest and deportation.

5. *Legal Facts.* Besides legal conditions[30] and legal claims,[31] *tpś* can denote matters of legal fact. Unlike Ex. 22:15-16(16-17), which focuses on the property rights of a father whose unbetrothed daughter has been seduced, Dt. 22:28-29 deals with an actual case of forcible rape *(tpś)* and its discovery; in a kind of "legal parenesis," the rights of the father are weakened and those of the woman are strengthened vis-à-vis the historical legislation of Ex. 22:15-16(16-17).[32] Like this text, Dt. 21:18-21 also reveals an historical development: the apodictic family law of Ex. 21:15-17 is shifted to the local juridical community.[33] If a son repeatedly refuses to obey his parents, his father and mother are to take hold of him (*tpś,* v. 19) and bring him before the local court, which imposes sanction for transgressing the law.

---

29. III, 18-27; see *ANET,* 287-88; *TUAT,* I, 389.

30. See II.2 above.

31. See II.3 and II.4 above.

32. E. Otto, *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 26 (1982) 284-89.

33. E. Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründigungen in der Gesellschaftgeschichte des antiken Israel. Studia biblica* 3 (Leiden, 1988), 32-33, 64.

There is no discernible element of force in Nu. 5:13, a casuistic priestly addition[34] that lends precision to a text describing the trial by ordeal of a woman suspected of adultery who has not been "caught" *(tpś)* in the act by a witness. Ezk. 21:28-29(23-24) also involves an unresolvable question of guilt: "The prophet affirms with all sharpness that the oracular decisions, which the Babylonian king receives at the junction of the roads and which those in well-defended Jerusalem believe they can despise, carry within themselves the full weight of a divine decision, in spite of the Israelite contempt for such an oracle technique. Through it guilt will be revealed, brought to proof, and from there the 'affliction,' which continues the accusation, will be legally possible."[35] The "affliction (or detention)" *(tpś)* will be carried out with a (firm) hand *(bakkap̱).*

III. Later Development.

1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The Dead Sea Scrolls almost never use *tpś* in the concrete sense of "seize" or "capture." Such a sense may be present in 11QT 57:7,11, an extrapolation of the Dtn law of the king. Conquest is envisioned in 1QpHab 4:7, interpreting Hab. 1:10, where the "Kittim" (in OT usage, clearly Greeks from Cyprus [Gen. 10:4; 1 Ch. 1:7; etc.], but in the scrolls a code name for the Seleucids/Ptolemies or the Romans) surround the fortification, take them *(tpś),* and demolish them *(hrs).* A similar sense is found in 2Q22 1 3, which speaks of a battle *(mlḥmh)* in which fortified cities are captured *(ltpś)* (cf. also the isolated fragment 2Q23 5 2). In 11QT 58:14, likewise in a military context, the participle probably refers to warriors.

Elsewhere a metaphorical use of the verb predominates, which recalls the language of the Psalms. In the Hodayot, for example, the speaker wants to see the idolaters ensnared in their plans (*ytpśw bmḥšbwtm,* 1QH 4:19) or bewails the plans of his enemies, which are intended to catch others in their nets (*lhtpś bmṣwdwtm,* 4:12). Nets used as snares also appear in CD 4:15-19, which speaks of the three nets (*mṣwdwt:* fornication, wealth, and defilement of the temple) in which Belial ensnares Israel (*tpś,* 4:16,18,20; cf. 6Q15 1,2: [*nt]pśym,*//CD 4:20[36]). In 4Q270 9 2:20-21 we find the warning not to be "captured" by the deeds of the wicked.

But the meaning can also be attenuated. In 1QS the speaker promises not to "be involved" (*tpś,* 1QS 10:19-20//4Q260 1 4:8) in any dispute *(ryb)* with the "men of the pit" *('nš*[*y*] *šḥt)* until the day of vengeance *(ywm nqm).* Here the legal background is suggested only in passing. But the Damascus Document speaks of a case in which a repeat offender whose first capital offense was attested only by a single witness is "caught" (*tpś,* CD 9:19) and thus brought to judgment (*mšpṭ,* 9:20). Two other occurrences (4QpHos^b 16 1; 4Q504 4 22) are in fragments that do not preserve the context; 11QT 64:3 echoes Dt. 21:9.

2. *LXX.* For the semantic spectrum of "grasp, capture, conquer," the LXX prefers *lambánein* or it its compound *syllambánein* (1 S. 15:8; 1 K. 13:4; 18:40; 20:8; 2 K.

---

34. P. J. Budd, *Numbers. WBC* 5 (1984), 66.
35. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 445.
36. M. Baillet, *RB* 63 (1956) 515.

from *pth* II, "make spacious," while Rashi[2] translates the same word with "seduce, lead astray" (from *pāṯâ* I; cf. Dt. 11:16; Job 31:27), because many were led astray in that place. Other etymologies either posit an otherwise unattested root *ypt* (also the root from which *môpeṯ*, "emblem," supposedly derives) or derive the word from *yāpâ*, "be beautiful," on the grounds that the vicinity of Topheth was a royal garden, beautifully laid out (Jerome described it as attractive and forested [*amoenus atque nemorosus*]).[3]

With many earlier figures (such as Castellius, Buxtorf, Luther, and Seldenius) as well as more recent scholars, Panecius held the view that the word *tōpeṯ* is based on *tōp*, "drum" (from *tpp*).[4] Ancient Jewish tradition has it that there were many drummers and musicians who drowned out the screams of the young consigned to the flames, so that the parents of these wretched children would not perceive their terror.[5] Thenius[6] agrees with the theory of Boettcher[7] that with *tōpeṯ* "a Hebrew name based on talmudic *tôp* was given to something designated as a place of burning by a foreign word (Pers. *tōften*, 'burn, consume'); this name represented the site as a place to be spat upon and abominated." Job 17:6 uses the homonym *tōpeṯ* (usually translated "spit"), derived from the biliteral root *tp*, "spit."[8] Gesenius also notes the Persian etymology, but (with Noldius and Lorsbach) prefers the derivation from *topteh* (Isa. 30:33, "burning place").[9] Roediger,[10] however, prefers the derivation from "spit," with the same meaning as in Job 17:6.[11]

According to Robertson Smith,[12] *tōpeṯ* was an Aramaic word for "burning place,"

C. H. Ratschow (Berlin, 1976), 24-48; R. H. Kennett, "Tophet," *ERE*, XII, 388-89; P. Maiberger, "Genesis 22 und die Problematik des Menschenopfers in Israel," *BiKi* 41 (1986) 104-12, esp. 109-12; M. N. Panecius, *Dissertatio de Tophet valle Hinnom ad Jer. VII:31* (Wittenberg, 1694) = *Thesaurus Theologico-Philologicus*, I (Amsterdam, 1701), 818-22; S. D. F. Salmond, "Tophet, Topheth," in J. Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible*, IV (New York, 1904), 797-99; F. Saracino, "Filologi, padri e rabbini sul *Tophet*," in F. Vattioni, ed., *Atti della Settimana Sangue et antropologia biblica nella patristica* (Rome, 1982), 289-303; P. C. Schmitz, "Tophet," *ABD*, VI, 600-601; H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), esp. 101-7; L. A. Stager, "Phoenician Carthage — The Commercial Port and the 'Tophet,'" *Qad* 17 (1984) 39-49; R. de Vaux, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Eng. tr. Cardiff, 1964), esp. 73-90; H. Vincent, *Jérusalem*, I (Paris, 1912), esp. 124-34.

1. *MPL* 24 (1845), 735.
2. Bab. *'Erub.* 19a.
3. For details see Panecius.
4. P. 819.
5. A. Neubauer, *La géographie du Talmud* (1868, repr. Hildesheim, 1965), 150; Eerdmans, 28; according to Bonar, *tōpeṯ* means "music-grove."
6. O. Thenius, *Könige. KEHAT* IX (1849), 427.
7. P. 85.
8. See also K. H. Graf, *Der Prophet Jeremia erklärt* (Leipzig, 1862), 127.
9. *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum im Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leipzig, 1833), 1065-66.
10. *GesTh*, 1497-98.
11. For yet another view see F. Schwally, *ZAW* 10 (1890) 214; also W. Baudissin, *RE*, XIII, 280.

and Kidron valleys come together.[38] Simons emphasizes that at least in Neh. 11:30 "the valley of Hinnom" refers to the Wadi er-Rababeh, which runs eastward south of the Old City of Jerusalem. Topheth was probably situated at the broad mouth of this wadi, not far from the Potsherd Gate (Jer. 19:2,14). But any attempt to locate the Hinnom Valley (Josh. 15:8; 18:16; Neh. 11:30) and Topheth precisely involves great uncertainty.[39] In 2 K. 23:10; Jer. 7:30-31; 19:6, Topheth is located in the Hinnom Valley. Jer. 31:40 calls this valley a "valley of dead bodies and ashes."

IV. Function. With the exception of Isa. 30:33, Topheth is mentioned in conjunction with the cult of Molech only in the book of Jeremiah and DtrH (2 K. 23:10).[40] Ewald even believed that the use of the word *tōpeṯ* "in this special sense" was not customary as late as the time of Isaiah.[41] It should be noted that "Molech" has been interpreted both as the name of a god and as a sacrificial term.[42]

In 2 K. 23:10 we read of Josiah's desecration of Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom, "so that no one would make a son or daughter pass through fire for Molech."[43] According to 2 K. 16:3 and 21:6, human sacrifice had been offered, particularly in the time of the Judahite kings Ahaz and Manasseh. The expression *'br* (hiphil) *bā'ēš,* a "conveyance" formula, is fairly common in the OT[44] and is mentioned in conjunction with Molech (Jer. 32:35; cf. Lev. 18:21). Fuhs believes that the formula *he'ᵉḇîr lᵉyhwh* in Ex. 13:12 refers not to a sacrifice but to "a consecration and offering of the firstborn child to Yahweh." Such formulas as *he'ᵉḇîr lᵉyhwh* and *he'ᵉḇîr lammōleḵ* are form-critically identical and should be treated as synonymous. The expression in 2 K. 23:10, he believes, is a secondary development incorporating standard elements of the form, and refers to a kind of magical consecration.

In Jer. 7:31-32 (cf. 19:5-6), the prophet declares in his "temple sermon" that the "sons of Judah" have contravened Yahweh's commandment "by building the high place [!][45] of Topheth in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire." Jer. 19:5 recounts Jeremiah's breaking of a jug (v. 10; cf. v. 1) while he once more speaks of high places — this time of Baal *(bāmôṯ habba'al)* — in the Valley of Hinnom (cf. 32:35).[46] Here Topheth and Baal are identified by a typical

35. See also O. Eissfeldt, *Molk als Opferbegriff im Punischen und Hebräischen und das Ende des Gottes Moloch* (Halle, 1935), 62 n. 1, who locates Topheth in the Tyropoeon Valley itself.

36. F. M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* I (Paris, ³1967), 401-2.

37. J. Simons, *GTTOT* §36; idem, *Jerusalem in the OT* (Leiden, 1952), 10ff., esp. 12.

38. For other views see Salmond, 798-99; Heider, 351-52.

39. Heider, 352 n. 690.

40. Schmitz, 601.

41. H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* III (Göttingen, ³1866), 718 n. 2.

42. H.-P. Müller, → VIII, 375-88.

43. Spieckermann, 101 n. 146.

44. Ibid., 102; H. F. Fuhs, → X, 417-18.

45. Spieckermann, 103.

46. See also Maiberger, 110.

(v. 18[17]) ends in words of hope: "For the needy shall not always be forgotten; the hope of the poor shall not perish *('āḇaḏ)* forever" (v. 19[18]; cf. Job 5:16).

3. *The Nation.* Texts dealing with the situation of Israel in exile exhibit a dependence on the language of the Psalms and wisdom literature. In Ezk. 37 Israel's total lack of hope is expressed by the image of dry bones (vv. 1-10) and the people's statement that their bones are dried up and their hope lost (v. 11b) — an image radically reversed in the prophet's vision of the bones restored to life. The context of Lam. 3:29 uses both *yḥl* (vv. 21,24,26) and *qwh* (v. 25). The verse speaks quite generally and vaguely of Yahweh as a source of hope even in this national catastrophe. Here, however, hope is qualified by a "perhaps" *('ûlay yēš tiqwâ),* which is connected — in a clear echo of wisdom principles — with the requirement that the people must sit alone in silence, bearing the yoke imposed by Yahweh (vv. 26-28).

Jer. 29:11 assures Israel that Yahweh's plans envision its welfare, not its harm — the gift of a future with hope. The text combines this assurance with the promise that if Israel seeks Yahweh with all its heart, Yahweh will gather his people again and bring them back to this place. In Jer. 31:16-17 weeping Rachel is promised that there will be "a reward for your labors," interpreted as synonymous with "a hope for your future." The "labors" do not represent something Rachel has done to merit a future for Israel but rather the hardship of her motherhood,[25] which this promise delivers from futility, since her children will return to their ancestral land.

Zec. 9:12 also presupposes the exile and diaspora. Zion is promised that Yahweh will be faithful to his covenant and bring back the prisoners, who can therefore be called "prisoners of hope." Similar language is found in Hos. 2:17(15), in the otherwise unique statement that Yahweh will make the Valley of Achor a "door of hope" for Israel. These words promise Israel a future associated with a new exodus, which involves Israel's originally inviolate relationship with God. Only such a future, centered on God, can justify Israel's hope.

IV. 1. *LXX.* In two-thirds of the occurrences of *tiqwâ,* the LXX translates it with *elpís* (20 times) or *eúelpis* (Prov. 19:18). Three times we find *hypomoné̄* and twice *hypóstasis.* In Zec. 9:12 and probably also Hos. 2:17(15), the LXX erroneously reads a form of the root *qwh* II.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Except for an allusion to Hos. 2:17(15) in 1QM 11:9, the occurrences of *tiqwâ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls are concentrated in 1QH. There it denotes the hopes and expectations bestowed by God's grace (3:20; 9:14) or in response to conduct according to God's will (6:6); such hopes can also perish in God's judgment (3:2; 6:32). The afflicted hymnodist finds himself in the land of Belial, where the arrows of the Pit fly remorselessly and destroy without hope (*'yn tqwh,* 3:27 = 4Q432 4 2:3).[26]

25. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 ([3]1968), 197.

26. M. Mansoor, *RevQ* 3 (1961) 259-66, esp. 264-65.

(bread of) "tribute, oblation, offering."[5] Other interpretations[6] have fallen out of favor. In one ritual text,[7] *trmt* probably introduces a list of offerings,[8] which also includes *šlmm.*[9]

The variation in orthography *(trmt/trmmt)* has been explained as possibly marking the contrast between singular and plural.[10]

Seidl

2. *Occurrences.* In the OT *t^erûmâ* occurs 76 times. There is also a single occurrence of *t^erûmîyâ* in Ezk. 48:12. The distribution of the word is very uneven: it occurs 20 times in Ezekiel, 18 in Numbers, 17 in Exodus, 6 in Leviticus, 4 in Nehemiah, 3 each in Deuteronomy and 2 Chronicles, and once each in 2 Samuel, Deutero-Isaiah, Malachi, Proverbs, and Ezra. These occurrences are restricted for the most part to later texts of the OT, with concentrations in P and its later expansions as well as in Ezekiel. Probably only the occurrences in 2 S. 1:21, Prov. 29:4, and Dt. 12:6,11,17 are preexilic.

II. Meaning and Usage.

1. *Meaning.* The basic meaning of *rûm* hiphil is "lift, raise."[11] If *t^erûmâ* derives from this hiphil stem,[12] we arrive at the meaning "raising, elevation" preferred by many translations (e.g., AV "heave offering"). This meaning is actually present only in 2 S. 1:21; but the hiphil of *rûm* can also mean "remove, take away,"[13] hence "separate, hand over";[14] the corresponding meaning of *t^erûmâ* in the majority of cases would be "contribution."

2. *Lexical Field and Constructions.* That *t^erûmâ* generally refers to a kind of contribution is clear from its lexical field. It is constructed with the following vbs.: *bô'* hiphil, "bring," used in relatively early texts such as Dt. 12:6,11, as well as Ex. 35:5,21,24; 36:3,6; Lev. 10:15; Neh. 10:40; 2 Ch. 31:10,12; *lqḥ,* "take," with *min,* a construction showing clearly that the noun denotes a portion separated from a larger whole (Ex. 25:2-3; 35:5; 36:3; Lev. 7:34); *ntn,* "give" (Ex. 30:13-15; Lev. 7:32; Nu. 15:21; 18:8,28; 31:29,41; Ezk. 44:30; 2 Ch. 31:14); *qrb* hiphil, "offer" (Lev. 7:14; Nu. 5:9);

5. Dietrich and Loretz, 399; *TO,* I, 269; *UT,* no. 2311.

6. E.g., *WUS,* no. 2517 (verb!); summarized in *TO,* I, 269-70.

7. *KTU* 1.43, 6.

8. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Das Ritual R.S. 1.5 = CTA 33," *UF* 7 (1975) 525-28; see also J.-M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit. CahRB* 19 (1980), 103.

9. L. 7.

10. R. M. Good, "Geminated Sonants, Word Stress, and Energic *IN-NN/-.NN* in Ugarit," *UF* 13 (1981) 117-21, esp. 118, 120-21.

11. → XIII, 406-7.

12. *GK,* §85r.

13. → XIII, 407 (4.b).

14. Ibid. (4.c).

In Isa. 40:20 it is almost certain that *t^erûmâ* means "offering with reference to an idol of wood," but uncertainty concerning the interpretation and semantics of *ham^esukkān* has led to debate about the syntax of the verse.[23]

Seidl

In Nu. 31 (P), a very late text, the persons and animals taken from the booty captured in the campaign against the Midianites and set apart for the priests and Levites is called *t^erûmaṯ yhwh* (vv. 29,41). The term *meḵes* also appears here (uniquely) in the sense of "tribute" (vv. 28,37-41), again in combination with *yhwh.* An addition in vv. 48-54 describes the offering of the captured jewelry as an act of atonement (v. 50; cf. Ex. 30:12,16). Nu. 31 also uses the term *t^erûmâ* (v. 52); but the same passage also calls the solemn offering *qorbān*[24] (v. 50), an inclusive term for any offering, used only in texts belonging to P.

The half-shekel tax described in Ex. 30:11-16 is also a unique event, at least as the narrative presents it. However, it was probably a general head tax levied by the postexilic community,[25] designated "for the service of the tent of meeting" (v. 16a), i.e., for the support of the temple.

As already in Ezk. 44:30 and Lev. 22:12 (H), *t^erûmâ* often denotes the portion set aside for the priests (e.g., Nu. 5:9; 18:8). The provisions for the priests consisted of grain and certain portions of the animals sacrificed. Nu. 15 speaks of a contribution from the threshing floor (*t^erûmaṯ gōren,*[26] v. 20b; cf. Nu. 18:27), a contribution of bread (v. 19), and a contribution from the first batch of flour (vv. 20-21) in the form of a loaf of ring bread (*ḥallâ;* cf. Lev. 7:12-14). The way the contributions of grain were collected in the period of ChrH we learn from Neh. 10:40(Eng. 39); 12:44; 13:5: chambers were provided where all the contributions could be stored. These storerooms are also mentioned in 2 Ch. 31:10-14, where the contributions are called *t^erûmâ* in vv. 10,12,14. This text also makes special mention of tithes (*ma'^aśēr;*[27] cf. Mal. 3:8), as do the passages in Nehemiah.

This terminology is similar to that in Nu. 18, where *t^erûmâ* — in contrast to the tithe — is a general term for "contribution." In Nu. 18:8,19, *t^erûmâ* stands for all the offerings and contributions listed between these two verses as the priestly portion due in perpetuity. Then vv. 20-24 turn to the support of the Levites and the tithes they are to receive, which are called *t^erûmâ* in v. 24. But the tithe to be set apart for the priests by the Levites, a tithe of the tithe, is also called *t^erûmâ* (v. 26).

Neh. 10:39-40(38-39) also speaks of a tithe of the tithes, which the Levites are to

---

23. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja I: 40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 60-62; for more recent discussion see H. G. M. Williamson, *Bibl* 67 (1986) 1-20; M. Hutter, "Jes 40,20 — kulturgeschichtliche Notizen zu einer Crux," *BN* 36 (1987) 31-36; A. Fitzgerald, "The Technology of Isaiah 40:19-20 + 41:6-7," *CBQ* 51 (1989) 426-66.

24. → XIII, 157.

25. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. tr. 1962), 236.

26. → III, 62-63.

27. → עשׂר *'eśer.*

bring to the chambers of the storehouse; this contribution is called a *tᵉrûmâ* of grain, wine, and oil. In different ways Neh. 12:44 and 13:5 also connect tithes and *tᵉrûmâ* with other donations. In 2 Ch. 31:10 *tᵉrûmâ* appears once more as a general term for all kinds of donations; v. 12 mentions *tᵉrûmâ* and *maʿᵃśēr* in the same breath.

Several texts, all belonging to P, call the priests' share of the sacrificial flesh *tᵉrûmâ.* The portion in question is the right thigh (*šôq hayyāmîn,* Lev. 7:32-33), called the "thigh of the elevation offering" (*šôq hattᵉrûmâ,* Ex. 29:27-28; Lev. 7:34; Nu. 6:20) (AV "heave offering"; instead of this traditional translation, *HAL* prefers "contribution,"[28] i.e., "thigh set apart as a contribution"). It appears in conjunction with the "wave offering" (*ḥᵃzēh hattᵉnûp̄â,* Ex. 29:27; Lev. 7:34; 10:14-15; Nu. 6:20). According to Lev. 10:14, the priestly families may eat both in any clean place.

d. *Wave Offering and Elevation Offering.* The juxtaposition of two different offering portions, each called by a different name, raises the question of the origin and nature of these offerings. Were they both ritual acts? Most scholars assume a ritual element for the *tᵉnûp̄â* but reject it for the *tᵉrûmâ.*[29] Driver and Kopf, however, see no essential difference between the *tᵉnûp̄â* and the *tᵉrûmâ.*[30] Kopf bases his conclusion on an Arabic etymology for the former, arguing that *nûp̄* hiphil is synonymous with *rûm* hiphil, "raise." Nevertheless, the two must be considered distinct.

We assume initially that the sacrifices of well-being *(šᵉlāmîm)* had regional variations (e.g., Dt. 18:3 describes the priests' portion as comprising the shoulder, the two jowls, and the stomach) and that these traditions coalesced in the later temple cult. In the *šᵉlāmîm* offering as described in Lev. 7,[31] the fat is burned on the altar and the breast allotted to the priests, after which it is consecrated as a *tᵉnûp̄â* offering (vv. 30-31). This act may best be imagined as "swinging the sacrificial portions back and forth in the direction of the altar,"[32] a symbolic offering of the sacrifice. Next, probably representing a different tradition, the right thigh is presented as an offering for the priest (*tᵉrûmâ lakkōhēn,* vv. 32-33). Other sacrificial texts often refer to the right thigh as a portion for the priests (Ex. 29:22,26; Lev. 8:25ff.; Nu. 18:18). Being given this portion was already a token of honor in the ancient period, as 1 S. 9:24 shows. Finally, the "*tᵉnûp̄â* breast" and "*tᵉrûmâ* thigh" appear together as a perpetual due for the priesthood (v. 34). The latter expression does not refer to a ritual act of elevation; late expansions of the text, however, speak of swinging the right thigh as well (Ex. 29:22-24; Lev. 8:25-27; 9:21). A late supplement (Lev. 10:15) even speaks of swinging the "thigh that is raised." Here we observe the tendency to standardize the sacrificial regulations.

28. *HAL,* II, 1789-90.

29. See already Eissfeldt, 56; also (among others) Dussaud, 111-12; Vincent, 269-70; R. Hentschke, *Satzung und Setzender. BWANT* 83 (1963), 34-35 n. 16; Milgrom, *Tarbiz* 42.

30. Driver, 104; Kopf, 263-64.

31. → IX, 298-99.

32. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 102.

III. LXX. The LXX most commonly translates *t^erûmâ* with *aparché̄*, "(offering of) firstlings," which is also a standard translation of *rē'šîṯ*:[33] 15 times in the singular, 25 times in the plural (20 of the latter representing a Hebrew singular). Another common translation is *aphaírema*, "removal" (29 times, all but 1 in the Pentateuch), a translation that occasionally (5 times) also represents *t^enûpâ*. The translation *eisphorá*, "contribution," referring to the half-shekel tax, appears 3 times in Ex. 30:13-15. In Isa. 40:20 we find *homoíōma*, probably reflecting Heb. *t^emûnâ*. Prov. 29:4 uses *paránomos*.

Wächter

Güting believes that the Hebrew terms for "contribution" lie behind the deuterocanonical texts Sir. 7:31; 35:7-8; Tob. 1:6-7; 5:14; Jdt. 11:13.[34] This assumption has been proven correct in the case of Sir. 7:31 *(trwmh* twice, representing *dósis* and *aparché̄);* for Sir. 35:7-8 (LXX) cf. 32:11-12 (Hebrew).

Seidl

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The noun *t^erûmâ* occurs some 25 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, often in a figurative, spiritualized sense, since the rituals of the sacrificial cult could not be performed at Qumran and therefore had to be reinterpreted.[35] Several texts speak of the "offering of the lips" (*t^erûmaṯ ś^epāṯayim*, 1QS 9:4-5,26; 10:6//4Q256[S^b] 3 2:4; similarly 1QS 10:14 and 4Q511 63+64 2:4; possibly 4Q513 2 2:3). According to 1QS 9:4-5, this offering is like the "pleasing aroma of righteousness." Similar to this usage in the Manual of Discipline is the expression "offering of the tongue" in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (*t^erûmaṯ lāšôn*, 4Q400 2 7; 4Q403 1 2:26; 4Q405 23 2:12). In such contexts *t^erûmâ* is best translated "offering of praise," so that *t^erûmaṯ ś^epāṯayim* and *t^erûmaṯ lāšôn* are practically synonymous. Newsom divides the latter phrase, connects *trwmwt* with the preceding *r'šy*, and interprets the new phrase as an angelic title, "chiefs of praise-offerings."[36]

Finally, one of the standards for the holy war bears the inscription *t^erûmaṯ 'ēl* (1QM 4:1//4Q496[M^f] 16 5:4).

But the Qumran library also includes texts enshrining a well-developed tradition that echoes the sacrificial laws of the OT, as discussed above (11QT 15:11; 20:14; 21:2; 60:4). Here, however, we may be dealing with literature antedating the Qumran community. That possibility is unlikely, however, in the case of 4Q258(S^d) 3 2:5, with the parallelism *zbḥym wtrwmwt wndbym* (Dt. 12). The 5 occurrences in the 4Q Damacus Document tradition (4Q266 1:15; 4Q267 9 3; 4Q270 6 14,18,19), too, admit no doubt that we are dealing with an original use of sacrificial terminology. The same

---

33. → XIII, 269.

34. Pp. 14-17.

35. G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT. SUNT* 7 (1971).

36. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 334, 339.

I. Etymology. There have been innumerable attempts to explain the etymology of *t^erāpîm;*[1] the following are the most common.

a. Some maintain that *t^erāpîm* should be understood as a *taqṭîl* or *taqṭāl* form from the root *rp'*, "heal."[2] The word *r^epā'îm* (originally probably *rôp^e'îm*), "healers," has also been brought into the discussion. Therefore Albright[3] has proposed seeing in *t^erāpîm* a pejorative deformation of a hypothetical noun form (**tarpa'u?*) from the root *rp'*, from which the name of the Rephaim is also derived.[4]

b. Speiser[5] derives *t^erāpîm* from the root *rph,* "sink back, rest, be powerless, grow weaker," translating it as "inert things, idols."[6]

c. Others associate *t^erāpîm* with Ugar. *trp,* "grow weaker."[7]

d. Still others connect *t^erāpîm* with postbiblical *trp,* with the meaning "abominations."[8]

e. Labuschagne derives *t^erāpîm* from an original *p^eṯārîm,* "dream interpreters," changed by metathesis at a later date to make the referent an object of ridicule.[9]

f. Following a suggestion of the Assyriologist Benno Landsberger, Hoffner[10] proposes an etymological connection between *t^erāpîm* and Hitt.-Luwian *tarpi(š),* which "denotes a spirit which can on some occasions be regarded as protective and others as malevolent."[11] In lexical lists *tarpi(š)* is often represented by the Akkadogram *ŠĒDU,* "(protective) spirit," a meaning that could in many respects be associated with Heb. *t^erāpîm.*[12] Since the Hebrew lexicons do not provide a convincing etymology for *t^erāpîm,*[13] Hoffner's suggestion has found considerable support. Nevertheless, other suggestions have been brought

Nuzi," *VT* 37 (1987) 340-61; S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), esp. 136-46; F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (Giessen, 1892); E. Sellin, "Efod und Terafim," *JPOS* 14 (1934) 185-93; K. Seybold, "תְּרָפִים *t^erāpîm* idol(s)," *TLOT,* III, 1433-34; S. Smith, "What Were the Teraphim?" *JTS* 33 (1932) 33-36; K. Spanier, "Rachel's Theft of the Teraphim," *VT* 42 (1992) 404-12; K. van der Toorn, "Gods and Ancestors in Emar and Nuzi," *ZA* 84 (1994) 38-59; idem, "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence," *CBQ* 52 (1990) 203-22; J. Tropper, *Nekromatie. AOAT* 223 (1989); A. Tsukimoto, "Emar and the OT — Preliminary Remarks," *AJBI* 15 (1989) 3-24; idem, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege (kispum) im alten Mesopotamien. AOAT* 216 (1985); H. Vorländer, *Mein Gott. AOAT* 23 (1975), esp. 176-80; E. F. de Ward, "Superstition and Judgment," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 1-19.

1. See esp. *HAL,* II, 1794-96.

2. De Ward, 5-6; Rouillard and Tropper, 357-61; Tropper, 335, with n. 64.

3. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968), 146 n. 43.

4. Loretz, 138-39, 141-42, 148-51, 167-68. For criticism of this hypothesis see Hoffner, *BSac* 124:233-34; idem, *JNES* 27:62.

5. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* (1964), 245.

6. Cf. Albright, *BASOR* 83:40 n. 8.

7. Albright, *Archaeology,* 206 n. 63, interpreting the noun as meaning "old rags"; see also J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 745.

8. Also supported by W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (²1957), 311.

9. For criticism see Hoffner, *BSac* 124:232-33; idem, *JNES* 27:61-62.

10. *BSac* 124; *JNES* 27:63-68.

11. Hoffner, *JNES* 27:66; cf. Seybold, 1433.

12. *CAD,* XVII/2, 256-59.

13. *HAL,* II, 1794: "We do not risk making a decision"; Albright's varying proposals illustrate the same point.

forward by Hittitologists[14] and OT scholars;[15] indeed, the putative Hittite etymology for *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* is not without its problems. Even if it should turn out to be correct, it contributes little to our knowledge of the role played by the *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* in the religion of ancient Israel.

II. Ancient Near East. Although the word *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* has not been found outside the Hebrew Bible (unless it is a Hittite loanword), extrabiblical sources have been cited repeatedly to cast light on the function of the *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm*. Shortly after the publication of one Nuzi text,[16] Smith established a connection between the biblical *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* and the *ilānu* of the Nuzi text. On the basis of certain legal institutions at Nuzi, he associated the phenomenon of the *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* inheritance, property rights, and adoption in the realm of patriarchal law (e.g., Rachel's theft).[17] The parallel with the *ilānu* at Nuzi led scholars (above all Draffkorn) to identify the *t*ᵉ*rāp̱îm* as household gods.

It generally went unnoticed, however, that the Nuzi tablets mention not only household gods *(ilānu)* but also *eṭemmū*, "spirits," and cultic lampstands (ᵈZÁLAG.MEŠ).[18] Three texts speak of the *eṭemmū* alongside the *ilānu*. In two cases the context has to do with disinheriting someone. In a text cited by Chiera,[19] a disinherited son "shall have access to" *(alāku ina/ana)* neither the household gods (DINGIR.MEŠ = *ilānu*) nor the *eṭemmū*, nor the fields and houses.[20] In a second text[21] a man declares that his grandson shall no longer have access to his possessions, not even "to my [household] gods and my *eṭemmū*."[22] In a third text, a "disinheritance document," the signatory declares that, after the death of his wife, the one of his three daughters who remains in the house of her parents shall reverence *(palāḫu)* "the gods and my *eṭemmū*."[23]

The terminology of these texts with reference to the household gods and the *eṭemmū* suggests that we are dealing here specifically with figurines. This interpretation gains additional support from another text that forbids the making of substitute "gods."[24] Clearly the domestic cult at Nuzi involved care for the *eṭemmū* and the *ilānu* equally, in the presence of a cultic lampstand. In addition, the texts make clear that this domestic cult was primarily the responsibility not of the firstborn but rather of the one who continued to occupy the parental house.[25]

---

14. F. Josephson, *Florilegium anatolicum. FS E. Laroche* (1979), 181.

15. E.g., Rouillard and Tropper, 360-61.

16. C. J. Gadd, *RA* 23 (1926) 49-161, no. 51, 10-17; cf. *ANET*, 219-20.

17. Speiser, *Genesis*, 250; C. H. Gordon, *BA* 3 (1940) 1-12.

18. On such lampstands see Deller, 62-72; A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* (1956), 339 and passim.

19. E. Chiera, *Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi*, V (1934), no. 478, 6ff.

20. Cf. Deller, 72.

21. E. R. Lacheman, *Excavations at Nuzi, VIII: Family Law Documents. Harvard Semitic Series* 19 (1962), no. 27.

22. Ro. 11; cf. Deller, 72.

23. Yale Babylonian Collection 5142: 30′-31′; cf. J. Paradise, in D. I. Owen and M. A. Morrison, eds., *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi*, 9/1 (1987), 203-13.

24. Lacheman, *Excavations at Nuzi, V. Harvard Semitic Series* 14 (1950), 108.23-42; cf. Deller, 73-74.

25. Paradise, in Owen and Morrison, eds., *General Studies*, 211 n. 30.

More light is shed on the nature of the "household gods" at Nuzi by the references to "gods" in the Emar texts (from Meskene, Syria, ca. 1200 B.C.E.). The Nuzi material needs to be reexamined in the light of these texts,[26] many of which deal with inheritance. A large number of them speak of the "god(s)" of the family. Such references are formulated in a variety of ways. The commonest form is: "The gods (belong to) the main house. The main house is the portion of X, the eldest son." The principal heir had responsibility for taking care of the gods. The traditional formulas state that the heir was to invoke *(nubbû)* "the gods and the dead" of his (or her) father, to reverence *(palāḫu)* and care for *(kunnû)* them.[27] Ownership of the main house and responsibility for the domestic cult go hand in hand. This association is based on the presence of the gods in the primary house (cf. the translation of DINGIR-*lì* [*ša*] É GAL as "the gods belonging to the main house").

Although the interpretation of the expression "the gods and the dead" is disputed,[28] it provides a key to understanding the nature of the family gods. Analysis of the associated verbs shows clearly that a cult of the dead is involved. Especially common is the vb. *nubbû*, "invoke," as an equivalent to *šuma zakāru*, "name (invoke) the name."[29] The second verb, *palāḫu*, "reverence," is equally appropriate to a cult of the dead: to "reverence" the dead means to provide them with nourishment. The vb. *kunnû* has similar connotations; it rarely appears in connection with the cult of the gods, but is common in connection with funerary rites. This observation suggests that the "gods" in the Emar texts have something to do with ancestors. Thus the expression "the gods and the dead" is best explained as a hendiadys: the dead are called gods because of their privileged status. The gods, entrusted to the care of the principal heir, are the material symbols (statuettes?) of the family's ancestors; the new paterfamilias, the principal heir, is responsible for the continuity of their worship.

In at least two OT texts the word *'ᵉlōhîm* must be understood as "spirits of the dead": 1 S. 28:13 and Isa. 8:19.[30] The same phenomenon occurs in Ugaritic texts, where *rpîm* (ancestral spirits) are mentioned in parallel with *ìlnym* (divine beings), *ìlm* (gods), and *mtm* (the dead).[31] At Emar this West Semitic usage of the term "gods" may be due to Hurrian influence. Hurrian texts from Anatolia frequently use the expression "the god(s) of the father" (*enna attanni-wena*, also written DINGIR.MEŠ *A-BI*) to denote the ancestral gods.[32] In Akkadian, furthermore, the determinative DINGIR ("god") appears in combination with GIDIM ("spirit of the deceased, shade") only in texts from Anatolia (Boghazköi).

The evidence of the Emar texts is helpful for an analysis of the domestic cult at

26. A. Tsukimoto, *AJBI* 15 (1989) 3-24.
27. Huehnergard, 428-31.
28. See above.
29. Bayliss, 117.
30. See Müller.
31. *KTU* 1.6, VI, 45-49.
32. See the reference to G. Wilhelm in K. Koch, eds., *Studien zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (1988), 20 n. 32.

Nuzi, for the hendiadys "the gods *(ilī)* and the dead (*mītū* or *mētū*)" at Emar raises the possibility that the association of DINGIR.MEŠ with *eṭemmū* has the same reality in view, whether the expressions are synonymous or complementary. There is some evidence to support this conclusion: according to the Emar texts, the DINGIR.MEŠ must be understood as ancestral spirits. The similarities of domestic law and the socioeconomic situation in Emar and Nuzi, along with Hurrian influence, make it reasonable to assume that similar terms have similar meanings. We may also note the analogous religious obligations of the principal heir in other Mesopotamian documents. As the new head of the family, the heir was responsible for the funerary rites and sacrificial offerings for the deceased members of the family.[33] The responsibility for the cult of dead kin in Babylonian texts parallels the possession of the household *ilānu* at Nuzi — including the fact that the latter were figurines representing ancestors. As a final argument from Nuzi, we note that there the offerings for the dead *(kipsātu = kispātu)* were given to "the gods." This language could argue for identifying the *ilānu* with representations of ancestors.

In the Nuzi texts, then, the words *ilānu* and *eṭemmū* refer to deified ancestors. This usage accords with the hendiadys *ilī u mītī* in inheritance documents from Emar. The Old Babylonian legend of Etana, which contains the statement "I honored the gods and revered the spirits of the dead" *(ilānī ukabbit eṭemmē aplaḫ)*, shows that the parallelism *ilānu//eṭemmū* is not restricted to the Nuzi material.[34] This text illustrates the importance of domestic worship of ancestors, represented by figurines. According to the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic, such figurines were normally kept in the bedroom, for Gilgamesh took the oil horns of the bull of heaven into his bedroom to anoint his god Lugalbanda (probably a figurine of his deceased father Lugalbanda).[35]

III. OT.

The term *t^erāp̱îm* occurs 15 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen. 31:19,34,35; Jgs. 17:5; 18:14,17,18,20; 1 S. 15:23; 19:13,16; 2 K. 23:24; Ezk. 21:26(Eng. 21); Hos. 3:4; Zec. 10:2. Its form is always plural, even when it refers to a single image (1 S. 19:13); it has been suggested that some plural forms are actually singular forms with mimation.[36] Because it is difficult to harmonize the individual texts that refer to *t^erāp̱îm*, some have suggested that the words serve as a generic term or denote different objects.[37] It is safer to assume, however, that *t^erāp̱îm* has a single primary denotation that can take on several distinct connotations.

1. *Appearance.* Analysis of the 15 occurrences shows that the noun refers to a concrete object. We read of *t^erāp̱îm* being "made" (*'śh*, Jgs. 17:5) and "removed" (*b'r* piel, 2 K. 23:24). According to Gen. 31:19,30-35, Rachel stole (*gnb*, v. 19) the *t^erāp̱îm* of

33. Tsukimoto.
34. J. V. Kinnier Wilson, *Legend of Etana* (1985), 100-101.
35. S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (1989), 29 n. 68.
36. A. R. Johnson, *Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (²1962), 32 n. 4.
37. Seybold, 1433-34; Ackroyd.

her father. But there are no details about the nature and appearance of these objects. It is also not clear whether the form of the *tᵉrāpîm* remained constant or varied over the course of time and in different locales. It would appear, however, that we must reckon with certain variations. Gen. 31:34 gives the impression that the objects in question were relatively small (12 to 14 in.), since they could be hidden in a saddle *(kar).*

A further hint concerning the appearance of the *tᵉrāp̱îm* is found in 1 S. 19:11-17. It has been argued that this text suggests thinking of the *tᵉrāp̱îm* as cultic masks representing the human head.[38] This argument is not convincing, since it makes of *mᵉraᵓᵃšōṯāyw,* with its suffix referring to the *tᵉrāp̱îm,* textually redundant (v. 13). It is also hard to imagine that such an object could be covered with a *beg̱eḏ.* Regardless of whether *beg̱eḏ* is understood as a cloak or a blanket,[39] it must be bigger than a sculpted head. The text supports the conclusion that *tᵉrāp̱îm* refers to a material object that could lie on a bed, the prep. *ᵓel* notwithstanding. Although *ʿal* is more common with *miṭṭâ,* Gen. 49:33 and 1 S. 28:23 show that *ᵓel* can also be used when motion is involved. It was therefore perceived as normal that the object stood alongside the bed but could also be laid on the bed. Michal's staging was intended as a momentary deception: she draped the *tᵉrāp̱îm* on the bed so as to give the impression that her husband was lying there.

The same passage actually provides even more information. The *tᵉrāp̱îm* must somehow have appeared anthropoid, at least as regards the upper portion. The similarity to a human being was nevertheless limited. Michal had to resort to trickery and lay a *kᵉḇîr hāʿizzîm* over the head of the *tᵉrāp̱îm* (v. 13). Most likely this word refers to a net of goat hair;[40] the definite article indicates that we are dealing with an everyday household object. Hoffmann and Gressmann were probably correct in thinking of a kind of mosquito net draped over the head of the *tᵉrāp̱îm.*[41] The remainder of the *tᵉrāp̱îm* was covered with a *beg̱eḏ.* The purpose of both was to conceal from Saul's henchmen what they were really covering. The notion that Michal actually clothed the figure is out of the question. The covered object would most easily be mistaken for a living person if it was the size of a human being,[42] but so large an object is practically ruled out by Gen. 31. Some reduction in size is possible but cannot even be estimated. In any case, the dim light of Michal's bedchamber helped fool Saul's henchmen — but that tells us nothing about what *tᵉrāp̱îm* actually looked like.

2. *Function.* The evidence concerning the outward form of the *tᵉrāp̱îm* suggests a statuette, which Gen. 31 and 1 S. 19 associate with the household. But where were they kept?

The stories of Rachel's theft and Michal's deception show that the *tᵉrāp̱îm* stood in a relatively obscure spot, but that their absence was noticed immediately. Even though

---

38. Hoffmann and Gressmann, 100.
39. *Ges*[18], 123.
40. *HAL,* I, 458.
41. P. 100.
42. Gordon, 574.

This oracular aspect explains beautifully the "speaking" function of the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* in Zec. 10:2.

A final argument for identifying the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* with statues of ancestors appears when 2 K. 23:24 is compared with Dt. 18:11. The former text records that Josiah "put away the mediums *('ōḇôṯ)*, wizards *(yidd*ᵉ*'ōnîm)*, household gods *(t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm)*, idols, and all abominations." Dt. 18:11 appears to be the program behind Josiah's actions, listing various forms of divination that are incompatible with the purity of the Israelite faith. The author speaks of casting spells, clairvoyance, and consulting ghosts or the dead. In this list the "dead" *(mēṯîm)* parallel *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* in 2 K. 23:24. This parallelism can hardly be accidental, since the two passages must be considered closely related.

IV. Archaeological Evidence. The archaeological identification of the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* is a much-discussed question, on which much of the interpretation of the biblical texts naturally depends. For methodological reasons, however, it would be wrong to mix philological arguments and archaeological evidence. Therefore the hypothesis that the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* could not have been the size of human beings because archaeology has not demonstrated the presence of such statues in Palestine is inadmissible.[74] The argument for identifying cultic masks found in tombs with the biblical *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* suffers from a similar weakness.[75] All the clay masks discovered to date in Palestine come from tombs; none has been found inside a house. Their function is still a matter of speculation; the only evidence supporting the suggestion that cultic functionaries used them to represent a deity comes from classical antiquity.[76]

Gray associates the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* with the many Asherah and Astarte figurines found in Palestine.[77] According to him, these figurines functioned as *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* and were used in the context of fertility rites.[78] Since the *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* represent ancestors, however, this identification is untenable. Given equal numbers of male and female dead, it is also inexplicable that *t*ᵉ*rāp̄îm* should have primarily female features.

Archaeologists have identified certain ancestral figurines that have been discovered as "schematic statues," like those from the stelae temple at Hazor.[79] But these objects are quite small (ca. 8-10 in. tall); the lower portion could take the shape of a pedestal. They bear a certain resemblance to the anthropoid busts found in Egyptian houses, which are clearly associated with the cult of the dead.[80]

The Israelite statues are also comparable to the statuettes of ancestors used by the pre-Islamic Arabs; not only are they identical in size and form, but are also frequently

---

74. Contra Albright, *Archaeology*, 110-11.

75. Hoffmann and Gressmann; de Ward, 5; Reichert.

76. Reichert.

77. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 745.

78. See already Albright, *Stone Age*, 311; H. G. May, *Material Remains of the Megiddo Cult*, *OIP* 26 (1935), 27.

79. P. Beck, *TAJ* 17 (1990) 91-95.

80. R. J. Demarée, *The 3ḫ îḳr n R'-Stelae* (1983), 289-90.

represented in a sitting position.[81] To date, however, no "schematic figures" have been found in a domestic setting. Finally, we must reckon with the possibility that some thirty figurines from the rooms of a Chalcolithic palace in the Golan represent ancestors.[82]

V. 1. *Ancient Versions.* Normally the LXX translators, thinking of idols, use *eídōlon* or *glyptós* to translate *tᵉrāp̱îm.* We may also observe a clear attachment to the notion of a healing function.[83] In Hos. 3:4 the LXX uses *dḗlōn,* which suggests a connection between the *tᵉrāp̱îm* and the *'ûrîm.*[84] The use of *kenotáphia* in 1 S. 19:13,16 may preserve some trace of the basic meaning.

The Tgs. normally translate *tᵉrāp̱îm* with *ṣalmānayyā',* "images," or *dᵉmā'în,* "figures," although Tanḥuma Wayyeṣe is of the opinion that the *tᵉrāp̱îm* are so named "because they are made of filth *(tôrēp̱).*" To a certain extent this explanation fits with the usual translation of *tᵉrāp̱îm* in the Tgs. (*ṣlm* or *ṣlmn'*).

The Vg. normally uses *idola* for *tᵉrāp̱îm* (cf. Jgs. 17:5: "he made an ephod and teraphim, that is, a priestly vestment, and idols"). Occasionally it uses *statua* or *simulacra.* The other versions think in terms of idols, not simply visual representations.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Qumran scrolls *tᵉrāp̱îm* and *'ēp̱ôḏ* play no role. There is no mention at all of *tᵉrāp̱îm,* though *'ēp̱ôḏ* occurs at least 3 times. In the treasure inventory of the Copper Scroll (3Q15), *'pwdt* (possibly a construct form, but more likely a plural) appears in conjunction with *kly dm'* and *blgyn.* While *kly dm'* appears to mean a kind of aromatic ("incense"?) used in preparing a sacrifice,[85] *blgyn* probably means something like "sandalwood."[86] In this context *'pwdt* is probably interpreted correctly as "priestly vestments."

The word *'ēp̱ôḏ* also occurs in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. The plural appears in 4Q405 23 2:5, probably referring to the high priestly vestments of a group of angels.[87] The context of 11Q17 8-7 6 has many lacunae, but it is still possible to make out that at least some portions of this fragment have to do with priestly vestments.[88]

van der Toorn — Lewis

81. C. Rathjens, *Sabaeica,* II (1955), 61-78.
82. C. Epstein, *Qad* 13 (1980) 20-21.
83. Hoffner, *JNES* 27:61 n. 2.
84. De Ward, 4.
85. J. T. Milik, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân. DJD,* III (1962), 250.
86. Ibid., 251.
87. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 335.
88. Ibid., 372-73.

chrysólithos, found also in Josephus.[1] A similar but perhaps not identical color is suggested by Tg. Onq. on Ex. 28:20 and 39:13 and by Tg. Jon. on Ezk. 28:13: *k*ᵉ*rûm yammā',* "sea green." The chrysolite of modern mineralogy is olivine (yellowish green), but the ancient term could also refer to topaz, yellow beryl, or yellowish green chrysoberyl.

The earliest text usually thought to refer to the precious stone is Cant. 5:14, but the singular form *taršîš* in conjunction with *sappîrîm,* "sapphires," appears to suggest that we are actually dealing with a toponym used to denote the precious stone. If so, the verse should be translated: "His hands are rings of gold, set in Tarshish."[2] The ptcp. *m*ᵉ*mullā'îm,* like Akk. *mullû,*[3] clearly refers to setting a stone, but the prep. *b*ᵉ can either refer to the place ("in Tarshish") or be translated as "with" (i.e., with the precious stone).

Of the 3 occurrences in Ezekiel, none belongs to the original text. Ezk. 1:16, in the interpolated section comprising vv. 15-21,[4] states that "the appearance of the wheels" of the divine chariot throne had the gleam (lit. the "eye") of a *taršîš.* This interpolation reappears in a more sophisticated style in 10:9-12,16-17;[5] here the redactor speaks of the "eye of a *taršîš* stone," clearly a more correct expression, in which Tarshish once more appears to be a toponym, as in Cant. 5:14. It would be reasonable to conclude that a precious stone from Tarshish was simply called by the toponym and that this usage was not yet universal at the time when the Ezekiel passages underwent redaction.

The occurrence of *taršîš* in Ezk. 28:13 belongs to a gloss inspired by the description of the breastpiece of the high priest in Ex. 28:17-20 and 39:10-13.[6] In Ex. 28:20 and 39:13, *taršîš* is the name of one of the twelve precious stones set in the breastpiece of the high priest.[7] But the list of these stones (28:17-21; 39:10-14) itself was not part of the original description of the breastpiece; it is a later addition dating from the exilic or early Persian period.[8] Thus it is only since the 6th century B.C.E. that *taršîš* refers to a precious stone. The text of Dnl. 10:6 is inspired by Ezk. 1 and is certainly later.

We see, therefore, that *taršîš* was originally a toponym, appearing in Israel since the 8th or 7th century B.C.E. in the expression "Tarshish ship." This site was also the source of a precious stone, and hence its name came to denote the stone itself. In the Hellenistic period this stone was identified with chrysolite, as the LXX version of Ex. 28:20 and 39:13 shows.

II. Toponym. As is shown by an inscription of Esarhaddon as well as Ps. 72:10 and Jon. 1:3, Tarshish is a site at the extreme western end of the Mediterranean. To

---

1. *B.J.* 5.234; *Ant.* 3.168.
2. W. Rudolph, *Ruth; Hohe Lied; Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 158-59.
3. *AHw,* II, 598; *CAD,* X/1, 186.
4. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1979), 104-5.
5. Ibid., 104, 255.
6. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. tr. 1983), 82-83, 92.
7. → חשן *ḥōšen.*
8. K. Elliger, "Ephod und Choschen," *VT* 8 (1958) 19-35 = L. Rost, ed., *FS F. Baumgärtel. Erlanger Forschungen,* ser. A. 10 (1959), 9-23.

emphasize his worldwide sway, Esarhaddon claims that "all the kings in the midst of the sea, from Cyprus and Ionia to Tarshish (**kur***tar-si-si*)," have done obeisance to him.[9] In Ps. 72:10 the world dominion of the king is manifested in the tribute that is brought by "the kings of Tarshish and of the isles"; at Joppa Jonah boards a ship bound for Tarshish to evade his mission to Nineveh, fleeing as far as possible in the opposite direction.

The identification of Tarshish with Baetica *(Tharseís hē Baitikḗ)* in a Greek lexicon of the late Roman period[10] was accepted by Bochart;[11] if so, Tarshish and the Tartessos of classical tradition could be variants of the same name. This identification is probably correct. The identification with Tarsus, first found in Josephus,[12] is out of the question, since the Semitic form of this name is *trz/tarzu.* Furthermore, the earliest occurrence of *piršš* is in a late-9th-century inscription from Nora on Sardinia,[13] and the latest Punic occurrences of the gentilic **taršīšī* > *taršī* (with elision of a syllable) find an echo in Polybius in the forms *tarsḗion*[14] and *Thersítai.*[15] The alternation of the forms *taršîš* (Semitic) and *tartḗs(sos)* (Greek), as well as the Latin form *Turdet(ani),* reflects different articulations of an indigenous phoneme, probably an interdental sibilant. The name Tarshish, then, is Iberian or "Tartessian"; it is pointless to look for a Semitic etymology.

The expression "Tarshish ships" *(ʼᵒnîyôṯ taršîš)* should therefore refer to ships bound for Spain. This can actually be the case when they are mentioned in conjunction with Tyre (Isa. 23:1,14; Ezk. 27:25). It is also possible in Isa. 60:9, where Tarshish ships bring back the sons "from the isles," although this expression more likely means the Mediterranean coastlands in general. The Tarshish ships of Jehoshaphat sailed to Ophir, from which they transported gold to the harbor of Tell Qasile on the Mediterranean, whence it was brought inland.[16] It is therefore inconceivable that these ships ran aground near Ezion-geber (1 K. 22:49).

No places are mentioned in conjunction with Solomon's Tarshish ships (1 K. 10:22 //2 Ch. 9:21),[17] but since they appear together with the fleet of Hiram, we should probably think in terms of Mediterranean destinations. One may assume that the expression gradually took on the sense of "long-distance ships." The commodities imported on these ships include gold (1 K. 10:22//2 Ch. 9:21; cf. 1 K. 22:49; Isa. 60:9), silver (1 K. 10:22; Ezk. 27:12; cf. Isa. 60:9), ivory (1 K. 10:22; cf. Ezk. 27:15), iron, tin, and lead (Ezk. 27:12), as well as "chased and polished (precious) stones" (LXX 3 K. 10:22).

---

9. R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien. BAfO* 9 (²1967), 86, §57.10-11.
10. F. Wutz, *Onomastica sacra. TU* 41 (1914/15), 195-96, 697, 722.
11. S. Bochart, *Geographica sacra seu Phaleg et Canaan* (Leiden, ²1674), 188-94.
12. *Ant.* 1.127; 8.163; 9.208.
13. *KAI* 46.1; cf. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 83 (1941) 17-19.
14. *Histories* 3.24.2,4.
15. Ibid., 3.33.9.
16. *TSSI,* I², no. 4.
17. E. Hilgert, *BHHW,* III, 1697.

In Isa. 2:16 the Tarshish ships, especially beautiful and impressive, are the embodiment of human hubris. In a similar vein, Ps. 48:8(Eng. 7) speaks of hostile ships in revolt against Yahweh, which he shatters with an east wind.

III. Personal Names. The use of precious stones for personal names was common in antiquity.[18] It is therefore not surprising to find *taršîš* as a personal name in the Persian period (1 Ch. 7:10; Est. 1:14). Although the LXX (Vaticanus) reads *Ramessai,* "from Ramessa," in 1 Ch. 7:10, there is no reason to reject the MT. The name has a counterpart in an inscription from Silifke (Seleucia in Cilicia): *mnḗma Tarsisíou.*[19] In Est. 1:14, however, where the LXX reads *Sarsathaios* or *sarestheos,* the name appears to reflect a misreading: the text should read *štrʾ dm tʾtršyš,* where *štrʾ* represents Old Persian **Xšathra-a-,*[20] *dm* is **Taʰma-,*[21] and *tʾtršyš* is a name appearing at Behistun as *D-a-d-r-š-i-š* (Old Persian), *Da-tar-ši-iš* (Elamite), *Da-da-ar-šu* (Akkadian), and *Ddrš* (Aramaic).

Lipiński

18. *AN,* 256.
19. Duchesne.
20. M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana* (Vienna, 1973), 285, §11,1.7.3.2.
21. Ibid., 147, §8,344.